









MR. CLAY'S

SPEECH UPON THE TARIFF:

OR

THE "AMERICAN SYSTEM," SO CALLED;

OR

The Anglican System, in fact,

INTRODUCED HERE;

And perverted in its most material bearing upon Society, by the omission of a system of Corn Laws, for the protection of Agriculture.

MR. GILES'S SPEECH

UPON THE RESOLUTIONS OF INQUIRY

IN THE

HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF VIRGINIA,

IN REPLY TO MR. CLAY'S SPEECH:

ALSO,

HIS SPEECH

IN REPLY TO GEN. TAYLOR'S;

ACCOMPANIED WITH

SUNDRY OTHER INTERESTING SUBJECTS AND ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

*The whole containing a mass of highly useful Information
at the present Interesting Crisis.*

RICHMOND:

PRINTED BY THOMAS W. WHITE,

Opposite the Bell-Tavern.

.....

1827.

TO THE PUBLIC.

ACTING, under an irresistible sense of public duty; and with a view of protecting, the rights of this Commonwealth, aganist the usurpations of the General Government, I presented certain resolutions to the last General Assembly of Virginia, calling for an inquiry into the relative rights of the General and State Governments; grounded upon a fair interpretation of all our fundamental laws, according to their original words, tenor, and spirit.—Having made this call, it imposed on me, the farther duty, of stating to the House, my inducements for doing so. In the performance of this duty, I found it the most convenient mode of exhibiting my views, of the most pressing part of the subject, to have reference to a speech, delivered by Mr. Clay, in the House of Representatives, in favor of the tariff bill.—I had been often referred to this speech, by the friends of the tariff, as containing all its true doctrines; both constitutional, and politic. My attention had also, been particularly called to it, by a letter, from Mr. Clay himself. But finding; that, however ample, and abundant, the public considerations may be, for public acts; imputations of invidious, personal feelings, are constantly suggested, as motives, for public conduct; and being perfectly willing, that the private, as well as public relations, existing between any individual, implicated in my discussions, and myself, should be made known to the public, I have determined to give publicity, to the subjoined correspondence, between Mr. Clay and myself; with the accompanying certificate. Whilst, I feel the most perfect consciousness, of having, in every act of my public life, been influenced, solely, by public considerations; and feel the utmost contempt, for the little malicious minds; which could condescend to suggest, invidious private motives, for public acts, when they cannot, themselves, avoid seeing abundant public ones; I deem it proper here, for the purpose of counteracting the unfounded suggestions, incessantly brought forward in the public prints against myself, to state:—That I have never in my whole political life, solicited an office: nor a vote for an office:—That whilst, acting in the representative character, in Congress, I never would accept an executive office; and not only, often made that avowal in private conversations; but on one occasion, made a public declaration to the same effect.—That I resigned my office twice, and declined a re-election once, during my public service; proving incontestibly, that I had no inordinate solicitude for office; and, that, whether in, or out of office, I have at all times, taken due care, to preserve my personal independence, with an approving conscience; securing to me, a perfect exemption from all motives whatever, to do wrong. It will be necessary, to enable the public, to form a correct judgment, upon the conduct of Mr. Clay, in addressing the subjoined letter to me, to state a few facts, connected with that transaction. As soon as I saw the latitudinarian construction, placed

upon the Constitution, by the administrators of the practical government; which, in my judgment, went to obliterate every vestige of its restraining provisions; I could not avoid anticipating; either, a severance of the Union; or a consolidated despotism, of the very worst organization. These anticipations, seem, at this time, to be, but too rapidly, progressing to realities;—under this impression, I thought proper, to present to the public, my views of the inevitable tendencies of this new mode of interpreting the Constitution. In performing this task, I found it would be necessary to have reference to Mr. Clay and others, with whom, I had formerly acted in Congress, upon principles, directly opposed, in my judgment, to those, now advocated by the same gentlemen; and that some of my remarks might possibly bear hard, upon their most obvious inconsistencies, I therefore determined, not to avail myself of the cover of an anonymous signature, but to exhibit my opinions under my own proper name. After a number of my communications had been published, I received, most unexpectedly, the subjoined letter from Mr. Clay; written, with every mark of diplomatic ceremony, deliberation, and circumspection; and accompanied, with two copies of his speech upon the tariff bill. Whilst, I utterly disclaim all resentment, or hostility whatever, towards Mr. Clay, in consequence of his having addressed this letter to me; and the highly unwarrantable use he made of it, as I think, before its transmission, the transaction completely divested me of the respect, towards Mr. Clay, which is always felt by one gentleman, towards another; and this circumstance may, possibly, have led me in my commentary upon Mr. Clay's speech; inadvertently, to speak, without that respectful consideration, which is at all times, due from one gentleman to another; because, I did not consider Mr. Clay, as standing in that relation, towards me. Whilst it is possible, I may have been inadvertently led into a freedom of remark towards Mr. Clay, in consequence of an entire exemption from any obligation, towards him as a gentleman, which, if done, has been unconsciously, done; yet, as far as I am able to judge, there is no epithet in the remarks, applied to Mr. Clay, which is not perfectly warranted by the peculiar characteristics of his own speech. I think, many of the suggestions, contained in that speech, not only highly injurious to the interests, but insulting to the understandings of every wheat farmer, slave holder, and Southern, from Potomac, to the Gulf of Mexico inclusive. After having received Mr. Clay's most extraordinary letter, as I think it; and was informed, that he had condescended to make an unwarrantable use of it, before its transmission to me; I thought it an act of justice to Mr. Clay, to give him an opportunity of exculpating himself from the suggested imputation; but I had no mode of doing so. Being rendered physically unable to call upon Mr. Clay in person, for an explanation, which, whether made in person, or by another, would not have been done, in a spirit of revenge for private satisfaction; but for publication, with a view of submitting the transaction to public opinion; and the office, being of too delicate a character, to impose upon a friend;—I determined to wait until my eldest son came

of age, and to impose the unpleasant office upon him.—'This has been done; and its execution will appear by Mr. Archer's certificate. Mr. Clay having, thus, been afforded by me, an ample opportunity of exculpation, and refusing to avail himself of it; I consider the equivocation, as an admission; that he did make the unwarrantable use of the letter, which had been suggested. If, however, he did not; this publication will afford him a further opportunity of making any explanation of the transaction, he may think proper. The contents of Mr. Clay's letter; were of so singular a character, that it was difficult, upon the first blush, to put a satisfactory interpretation upon them.

For, whilst Mr. Clay, was certainly, perfectly at liberty, to be, as sarcastic, as he could be, towards myself; I did not think him at liberty to be so extremely sarcastic, as the contents of his letter certainly prove him to be, upon his own veracity, sincerity, and fidelity; nor could my imagination conceive, what manner of evil spirit it could be, that did tempt Mr. Clay to resort to this extraordinary letter, as an instrument, for privately indulging his revengeful feelings, arising from open, undisguised acts in relation to himself; and, as to the complaint intimated, that I had "discussed the public acts, and public conduct of those, who had the honor to concur, and co-operate with you (me) in important measures, adopted in the most eventful crisis of our common country," it is only necessary to observe, that in my public remarks, I had discussed those public acts, and that public conduct, which were directly at war with those public acts, and that public conduct, in which, heretofore, I had the honor "to concur and co-operate," with the gentleman alluded to. Believing the doctrines contained in Mr. Clay's speech, more bold and alarming, than any I had ever before seen avowed officially; I determined to give them as much attention at least, as he desired, and to write a critique upon them at that time; but I was then prevented, by a long continuation of ill health.

The discussion of the tariff question, in the House of Delegates, growing out of the resolutions of inquiry, afforded me an opportune occasion of making a general review of Mr. Clay's speech, instead of the critical one originally intended; and seemed to be invited by Mr. Clay himself. Although, when I called for an explanation from Mr. Clay, through my son, my object was merely to make a public disclosure of the transaction, if it should result as I had reason to expect; yet after the papers were returned, from farther reflection, I determined not to publish them.—This determination arose almost solely from my extreme reluctance in having my name brought before the public in any way whatever, unless impelled by considerations of importance to the public interests. But I have, within a few days, changed that determination. I have been reluctantly driven to this change, in consequence of the false, deceptive imputations, recently brought against me in the public prints devoted to Mr. Clay and the administration, of acting under the miserable influence of invidious personal motives for all my public acts; which, if the infamous suggestions were true, could not in the smallest tittle, alter the character

of those acts. Whereas, I here aver, that I do not indulge invidious feelings towards any human being ; and that I have not, at this moment, any desire whatever to fill any office, nor would I accept of any, in my present infirm state of health, except the one heretofore conferred upon me by the pleasure of the General Assembly. I hope that restraining from publishing this transaction of Mr. Clay's in the midst of the electioneering scene, which has overshadowed the whole country, from March, 1826, to this time, will protect me from the charge of voluntarily intermixing in that electioneering scene ; and of wishing my name, unnecessarily, to appear before the public on any occasion whatever. So far as I have brought it before the public, I have acted solely from public, not private, considerations ; nor have I intermixed in the electioneering scene, farther, than manifesting my most decided opposition to the present administration, grounded upon the firm conviction, that should it continue, American liberty is gone, and with it, the last vestige of hope for the future liberties of mankind. Nor have I now more confidence in its capacity for governing this nation, nor in the wisdom of its practical measures.—Under the anxious and afflicting influence of this conviction ; I should, indeed, deeply regret, could I believe, that there was one American citizen, more opposed to the measures and doctrines of the administration, or would more readily incur all the responsibilities of such opposition, than myself ; whilst at the same time, no American citizen can more truly and completely exempt himself from all invidious feelings towards its individual members.—I care not who reigns, if he be of good report, provided he reigns constitutionally ; and *reigns not me, and the American people*, out of our rights and liberties, given to us by our God, and secured to us, as we once fondly hoped, by the written constitutions of our country.

WILLIAM B. GILES.

October 8, 1827.

NOTE.—In August, 1790, I was first elected to the House of Representatives of the United States, for an unexpired term, and was re-elected for the ensuing term, during the same year. I was afterwards re-elected without opposition, till the year 1798—On the 2d day of October 1798, I resigned my seat in the House of Representatives of the United States.

In the following December, I was elected to represent the county of Amelia, in the House of Delegates of Virginia, and was re-elected the next year, 1799.

The year after, 1800, I was elected to the House of Representatives of the United States.

In 1803, I declined a re-election. When Mr. Eppes was elected to supply the vacancy.

In August, 1804, I was elected by the Executive Council, to the Senate of the United States, when in retirement at home ; and without the least intimation of the intention of the Council to confer that honor upon me.

On the 4th December, 1804, I was elected by the General Assembly for an unexpired term ; and on the 7th of the same month, was re-

elected for the ensuing term, commencing on the 4th of March, 1805, and ending 4th of March, 1811.

On January 2d, 1811, I was re-elected for the next term, commencing the 4th of March, 1811, and ending the 4th of March, 1817.

On the 23d November, 1815, I resigned the Senatorial office.

In 1816, I was elected by the county of Amelia to the General Assembly, whilst at home in a sick bed; and believed to be at the point of death.

And, in 1826, I was again brought forth as a candidate by the people of the county of Amelia, and elected to the House of Delegates.

I have every reason to believe, that my standing in the Senate, and in the public estimation generally, was as good on the 4th of March, 1815, as well as on the 23d November following, as it ever had been, at any period of my public service; and that I resigned, not on account of any unpleasant occurrences of a public character; as my letter of resignation will unquestionably prove. As an evidence of my standing in the Senate, in the session of 1814—1815, it will be necessary, only to state; that I was elected, I believe unanimously, if not, certainly nearly so, chairman of the War Committee; and left the Senate in that character, having the year before withdrawn from that station, in consequence of disapproving of the measures proposed for conducting the war.

Suggestions have often been repeated in the public prints; that I had been driven from my office in consequence of my extreme unpopularity, arising from a difference of opinion, between the General Assembly and myself, upon the true character of the obligation imposed upon the Senator, to obey instructions given by the Legislature; when that difference of opinion occurred in 1811; and in 1812, I vindicated my conduct upon that occasion; and put it on grounds, which, I thought, ought to have been satisfactory to all.

Hence it appears, that I had continued in office four years after giving the offence, and three years after my vindication, and had two years to serve, before the expiration of the term; of course, the resignation could not have been impelled by any consideration in relation to the right of instructions. If my desire of office, had been inordinately great, I might have served two years and then yielded to the supposed unpopularity of the instruction question. But notwithstanding the frequency of the repetition, in the public prints, that I had denied the right of the people to instruct their representatives; and of the state Legislature to instruct the Senators chosen by them respectively; *I never did deny the right of either*; and as it regards the right of the people to instruct their representatives, I was always a firm advocate of that right. Nor did I ever deny the right of the state Legislature, to instruct the Senators in the Congress of the United States, chosen by them respectively; but I did deny, that such constructions were absolutely mandatory upon the instructed Senator, and stripped him of all discretion in the exercise of his right to vote, granted to him by the express words of the constitution. The opinions, I then expressed, are in the following words, extracted from my speech printed at that time.

"The influence, or the true obligation of instructions, therefore, arises from the expression of opinion by the state legislatures; and the very high respect which is at all times due from the Senator to the expression of such opinion by the legislature of the state he represents—a respect which I feel so strongly, that I never would depart from an opinion thus expressed, unless in a clear and indisputable case; but the point I contend for is, that this opinion is not injunctive, compulsory or mandatory. That it is not in the nature of a command, but addressed to the discretion of the Senator instructed; taking into due consideration all the circumstances of the case connected with such instructions."

[See *Documents at the end.*]

WASHINGTON, 19th April, 1824.

My Dear Sir,

Always recollecting with pleasure, our acquaintance in public life, I have ever felt an unaffected interest in whatever concerns you, and particularly in respect to your health, which I had learnt was not good. I am, therefore, really happy in being authorized to infer, from certain ingenious and learned Essays with which you have enlightened the public, through the respectable medium of the Enquirer, that the state of your health, if not entirely re-established, is much improved; and that the unfortunate disputes and prosecutions in which, according to public rumor, you have been so long engaged with your Miller or Overseer, allow you sufficient leisure, once more to dedicate, to the public service, those fine talents, which I have so often had occasion to admire. I hope that you will be able to command from those unprofitable occupations, sufficient time to peruse a speech (of which I have the honor to transmit you a copy herewith) which I felt it to be my duty to deliver in the House of Representatives. It is sent to you for the sole purpose of exhibiting my real opinions, on the interesting subject of which it treats, and under the conviction, that it will be considered by you with, at least, the same candor and liberality with which you have, in the Essays above mentioned, discussed the public acts and public conduct of those who had the honor to concur and co-operate with you, in important measures, adopted in a most eventful crisis of our common country.

Wishing you, sincerely, an entire restoration of your health and much happiness,

I am, faithfully,

Your obedient servant,

H. CLAY.

WILLIAM B. GILES, Esq.

WIGWAM, February 19th, 1826.

Mr. Henry Clay.

SIR,—This note will be presented to you by my son, Mr. Thomas T. Giles, accompanied with a letter addressed by you, to myself, on the 19th day of April, 1824.—Your letter would have received some attention, immediately after its receipt; but I was rendered

unable to attend to its contents, at that time, by a severe illness, which commenced the day after its receipt, and continued for some months. During that time, several rumors reached me, stating, that the letter was merely intended as sarcastic, and that you had thought yourself at liberty to show it to a number of your friends, for your joint amusement. This letter, you also thought yourself at liberty, to forward to me, without apprising me of the use you had previously made of it. Since that time, I have received the positive assurance of a gentleman, whose name it is not necessary to mention, but in whose information, I have full confidence; that you did make such use of the letter, as is above stated. You are now requested to state explicitly in writing, whether or not you did show this letter to your friends, before you forwarded it to me; and the object you had in doing so? and whether, or not, you had written it as a mere sarcasm? I hope, sir, you will see the propriety of complying promptly with this request.

Your obd't servant,

WM. B. GILES.

I was requested, by Mr. Thomas T. Giles, to be present at an interview, between Mr. Henry Clay, and himself to day, at the house of Mr. Clay, who had been previously apprised by myself of the purpose, for which the interview had been invited. Mr. Giles presented to Mr. Clay two letters, the one the original, as I understood, of a letter addressed some time heretofore, by Mr. Clay, to Mr. W. B. Giles: the other a reply to that letter, or containing an enquiry, founded on its contents. Mr. Clay received, and perused the two letters, and then informed Mr. Giles, that in consequence of not recognizing him as an organ, free from objection, from his relation to Mr. W. B. Giles, for a communication, of the character, of that imported by the second letter, he should abstain from giving a reply to it, through him; but was prepared to give such reply, as he deemed the case required, whenever the objection derived from the present mode of communication should be removed. Mr. Clay then returned to Mr. Giles, the letter which appeared to have been formerly addressed by Mr. Clay to Mr. W. B. Giles, and informed Mr. T. T. Giles, it was at his option, to retain, or leave the letter now presented to himself: the latter of these alternatives, was adopted by Mr. Giles, and the interview terminated.

WM. S. ARCHER.

March 4th, 1826.

MR. CLAY'S SPEECH,

IN SUPPORT OF

AN AMERICAN SYSTEM

FOR THE PROTECTION OF AMERICAN INDUSTRY.

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

On the 30th and 31st of March, 1824.

THE gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Barbour) has embraced the occasion produced by the proposition of the gentleman from Tennessee, to strike out the minimum price, in the bill, on cotton fabrics, to express his sentiments at large on the policy of the pending measure; and it is scarcely necessary for me to say that he has evinced his usual good temper, ability, and decorum. The parts of the bill are so intermingled and interwoven together, that there can be no doubt of the fitness of this occasion to exhibit its merits or its defects. It is my intention, with the permission of the Committee, to avail myself also of this opportunity, to present to its consideration those general views, as they appear to me, of the true policy of this country, which imperiously demand the passage of this bill. I am deeply sensible, Mr. Chairman, of the high responsibility of my present situation. But that responsibility inspires me with no other apprehension than that I shall be unable to fulfil my duty; with no other solicitude than that I may, at least, in some small degree, contribute to recall my country from the pursuit of a fatal policy, which appears to me inevitably to lead to its impoverishment and ruin. I do feel most awfully this responsibility. And, if it were allowable for us at the present day to imitate ancient examples, I would invoke the aid of the Most High. I would anxiously and fervently implore His Divine assistance; that He would be graciously pleased to shower on my country His richest blessings; and that He would sustain, on this interesting occasion, the humble individual who stands before Him, and lend him the power, moral and physical, to perform the solemn duties which now belong to his public station.

Two classes of politicians divide the people of the United States. According to the system of one, the produce of foreign industry should be subjected to no other impost than such as may be necessary to provide a public revenue; and the produce of American industry should be left to sustain itself, if it can, with no other than that incidental protection, in its competition, at home as well as abroad, with rival foreign articles. According to the system of the other class, whilst they agree that the imposts should be mainly, and may, under any modification, be safely relied on as a fit and convenient source of public revenue, they would so adjust and arrange the duties on foreign

fabrics as to afford a gradual but adequate protection to American industry, and lessen our dependence on foreign nations, by securing a certain and ultimately a cheaper and better supply of our own wants from our own abundant resources. Both classes are equally sincere in their respective opinions, equally honest, equally patriotic, and desirous of advancing the prosperity of the country. In the discussion and consideration of these opposite opinions, for the purpose of ascertaining which has the support of truth and reason, we should, therefore, exercise every indulgence, and the greatest spirit of mutual moderation and forbearance. And in our deliberations, on this great question, we should look fearlessly and truly at the actual condition of the country, retrace the causes which have brought us into it, and snatch, if possible, a view of the future. We should, above all, consult experience—the experience of other nations, as well as our own, as our truest and most unerring guide.

In casting our eyes around us, the most prominent circumstance which fixes our attention, and challenges our deepest regret, is the general distress which pervades the whole country. It is forced upon us by numerous facts of the most incontestable character. It is indicated by the diminished exports of native produce; by the depressed and reduced state of our foreign navigation; by our diminished commerce; by successive unthreshed crops of grain, perishing in our barns and barn yards for the want of a market; by the alarming diminution of the circulating medium; by the numerous bankruptcies, not limited to the trading classes, but extending to all orders of society; by an universal complaint of the want of employment, and a consequent reduction of the wages of labour; by the ravenous pursuit after public situations, not for the sake of their honours and the performance of their public duties, but as a means of private subsistence; by the reluctant resort to the perilous use of paper money; by the intervention of legislation in the delicate relation between debtor and creditor; and, above all, by the low and depressed state of the value of almost every description of the whole mass of the property of the nation, which has, on an average, sunk not less than about 50 per cent. within a few years. This distress pervades every part of the Union, every class of society; all feel it, though it may be felt, at different places, in different degrees. It is like the atmosphere which surrounds us—all must inhale it, and none can escape it. In some places it has burst upon our people, without a single mitigating circumstance to temper its severity. In others, more fortunate, slight alleviations have been experienced in the expenditure of the public revenue, and in other favouring causes. A few years ago, the planting interest consoled itself with its happy exemption; but it has now reached this interest also, which experiences, though with less severity, the general suffering. It is most painful to me to attempt to sketch or to dwell on the gloom of this picture. But I have exaggerated nothing. Perfect fidelity to the original would have authorised me to have thrown on deeper and darker hues. And it is the duty of the statesman, no less than that of the physician, to survey with a penetrating, steady, and undismayed eye, the actual condition of the subject on which he would operate; to probe to the bottom the diseases of the body politic, if he

would apply efficacious remedies. We have not, thank God, suffered in any great degree for food. But distress, resulting from the absence of a supply of the mere physical wants of our nature, is not the only, nor, perhaps, the keenest distress, to which we may be exposed. Moral and pecuniary suffering is, if possible, more poignant. It plunges its victim into hopeless despair. It poisons, it paralyzes, the spring and source of all useful exertion. Its unsparing action is collateral as well as direct. It falls with inexorable force at the same time upon the wretched family of embarrassment and insolvency, and upon its head. They are a faithful mirror, reflecting back upon him, at once, his own frightful image, and that no less appalling of the dearest objects of his affection. What is the *cause* of this wide-spreading distress, of this deep depression, which we behold stamped on the public countenance? We are the same people. We have the same country. We cannot arraign the bounty of Providence. The showers still fall in the same grateful abundance. The sun still casts his genial and vivifying influence upon the land; and the land, fertile and diversified in its soils as ever, yields to the industrious cultivator, in boundless profusion, its accustomed fruits, its richest treasures. Our vigour is unimpaired. Our industry has not relaxed. If ever the accusation of wasteful extravagance could be made against our people, it cannot now be justly preferred. They, on the contrary, for the few last years at least, have been practising the most rigid economy. The causes, then, of our present affliction, whatever they may be, are human causes, and human causes not chargeable upon the people, in their private and individual relations.

What, again I would ask, is the *cause* of the unhappy condition of our country, which I have faintly depicted? It is to be found in the fact that, during almost the whole existence of this government, we have shaped our industry, our navigation, and our commerce, in reference to an extraordinary war in Europe, and to foreign markets, which no longer exist; in the fact that we have depended too much upon foreign sources of supply, and excited too little the native; in the fact that, whilst we have cultivated, with assiduous care, our foreign resources, we have suffered those at home to wither in a state of neglect and abandonment. The consequence of the termination of the war of Europe, has been the resumption of European commerce, European navigation, and the extension of European agriculture and European industry, in all its branches. Europe, therefore, has no longer occasion to any thing like the same extent as that which she had during her wars, for American commerce, American navigation, the produce of American industry. Europe in commotion, and convulsed throughout all her members, is to America no longer the same Europe as she is now, tranquil, and watching with the most vigilant attention all her own peculiar interests, without regard to the operation of her policy upon us. The effect of this altered state of Europe upon us, has been to circumscribe the employment of our marine, and greatly to reduce the value of the produce of our territorial, labour. The further effect of this twofold reduction has been to decrease the value of all property, whether on the land or on the ocean, and which I suppose to be about fifty per cent. And the still further effect has been to diminish

the amount of our circulating medium, in a proportion not less, by its transmission abroad, or its withdrawal by the banking institutions, from a necessity which they could not control. The quantity of money, in whatever form it may be, which a nation wants, is in proportion to the total mass of its wealth, and to the activity of that wealth. A nation that has but little wealth, has but a limited want of money. In stating the fact, therefore, that the total wealth of the country has diminished, within a few years, in a ratio of about fifty per cent. we shall at once fully comprehend the inevitable reduction, which must have ensued, in the total quantity of the circulating medium of the country. A nation is most prosperous when there is a gradual and untempting addition to the aggregate of its circulating medium. It is in a condition the most adverse, when there is a rapid diminution in the quantity of the circulating medium, and a consequent depression in the value of property. In the former case, the wealth of individuals insensibly increases, and income keeps ahead of expenditure. But in the latter instance, debts have been contracted, engagements made, and habits of expense established, in reference to the existing state of wealth and of its representative. When these come to be greatly reduced, individuals find their debts still existing, their engagements unexecuted, and their habits inveterate. They see themselves in the possession of the same property, on which, in good faith, they had bound themselves. But that property, without their fault, possesses no longer the same value; and hence discontent, impoverishment, and ruin arise. Let us suppose, Mr. Chairman, that Europe was again the theatre of such a general war as recently raged throughout all her dominions—such a state of the war as existed in her greatest exertions and in our greatest prosperity: instantly there would arise a greedy demand for the surplus produce of our industry, for our commerce, for our navigation. The languor which now prevails in our cities, and in our sea-ports, would give way to an animated activity. Our roads and rivers would be crowded with the produce of the interior. Every where we should witness excited industry. The precious metals would re-flow from abroad upon us. Banks, which have maintained their credit, would revive their business; and new banks would be established, to take the place of those which have sunk beneath the general pressure. For it is a mistake to suppose that they have produced our present adversity; they may have somewhat aggravated it, but they were the effect and the evidence of our prosperity. Prices would again get up; the former value of property would be restored. And those embarrassed persons who have not been already overwhelmed by the times, would suddenly find, in the augmented value of their property, and the renewal of their business, ample means to extricate themselves from all their difficulties. The greatest want of civilized society is a market for the sale and exchange of the surplus of the produce of the labor of its members. This market may exist at home or abroad, or both, but it must exist somewhere, if society prospers; and wherever it does exist it should be competent to the absorption of the entire surplus of production. It is most desirable that there should be both a home and a foreign market. But with respect to their relative superiority, I cannot entertain a doubt. The home market is first in order, and para-

mount in importance. The object of the bill under consideration, is to create this home market, and to lay the foundations of a genuine American policy. It is opposed; and it is incumbent upon the partisans of the foreign policy (terms which I shall use without any invidious intent) to demonstrate that the foreign market is an adequate vent for the surplus produce of our labour. But is it so? 1. Foreign nations cannot, if they would, take our surplus produce. If the source of supply, no matter of what, increases in a greater ratio than the demand for that supply, a glut of the market is inevitable, even if we suppose both to remain perfectly unobstructed. The duplication of our population takes place in terms of about twenty-five years. The term will be more and more extended as our numbers multiply. But it will be a sufficient approximation to assume this ratio for the present. We increase therefore, in population, at the rate of about four per cent. per annum. Supposing the increase of our production to be in the same ratio, we should, every succeeding year, have of surplus produce, four per cent. more than that of the preceding year, without taking into the account the differences of seasons which neutralize each other. If, therefore, we are to rely upon the foreign market exclusively, foreign consumption ought to be shown to be increasing in the same ratio of four per cent. per annum, if it be an adequate vent for our surplus produce. But, as I have supposed the measure of our increasing production to be furnished by that of our increasing population; so the measure of their power of consumption must be determined by that of the increase of their population. Now the total foreign population, who consume our surplus produce, upon an average, do not double their aggregate number in a shorter term than that of about 100 years. Our powers of production increase then in a ratio four times greater than their powers of consumption. And hence their utter inability to receive from us our surplus produce.

But 2dly, If they could, they will not. The policy of all Europe is adverse to the reception of our agricultural produce, so far as it comes into collision with its own; and under that limitation we are absolutely forbid to enter their ports, except under circumstances which deprive them of all value as a steady market. The policy of all Europe rejects those great staples of our country, which consist of objects of human subsistence. The policy of all Europe refuses to receive from us any thing but those raw materials of smaller value, essential to their manufactures, to which they can give a higher value, with the exception of tobacco and rice, which they cannot produce. Even Great Britain, to which we are its best customer, and from which we receive nearly one half in value of our whole imports, will not take from us articles of subsistence produced in our country cheaper than can be produced in Great Britain. In adopting this exclusive policy, the states of Europe do not inquire what is best for us, but what suits themselves respectively; they do not take jurisdiction of the question of our interests, but limit the object of their legislation to that of the conservation of their own peculiar interests, leaving us free to prosecute ours as we please. They do not guide themselves by that romantic philanthropy, which we see displayed here, and which invokes us to continue to purchase the produce of foreign industry, without regard to the state

or prosperity of our own, that foreigners may be pleased to purchase the few remaining articles of ours which their restricted policy has not yet absolutely excluded their consumption.

What sort of a figure would a member of the British Parliament have made; what sort of a reception would his opposition have obtained, if he had remonstrated against the passage of the Corn Law, by which British consumption is limited to the bread-stuffs of British production, to the entire exclusion of American, and stated that America could not and would not buy British manufactures, if Britain did not buy American flour?

Both the inability and the policy of foreign powers, then, forbid us to rely upon the foreign market as being an adequate vent for the surplus produce of American labour. Now let us see if this general reasoning is not fortified and confirmed by the actual experience of this country. If the foreign market may be safely relied upon, as furnishing an adequate demand for our surplus produce, then the official documents will show a progressive increase, from year to year, in the exports of our native produce, in a proportion equal to that which I have suggested. If, on the contrary, we shall find from them that for a long term of past years some of our most valuable staples have retrograded, some remained stationary, and others advanced but little, if any, in amount, with the exception of cotton, the deductions of reason and the lessons of experience will alike command us to withdraw our confidence in the competency of the foreign market. The total amount of all our exports of domestic produce for the year, beginning in 1795, and ending on the 30th September, 1796, was \$40,764,097. Estimating the increase according to the ratio of the increase of our population, that is, at four per cent. per annum, the amount of the exports of the same produce in the year ending on the 30th September last, ought to have been \$85,420,861. It was in fact only \$47,155,408. Taking the average of five years, from 1803 to 1807, inclusive, the amount of native produce exported was \$43,209,751 for each of those years. Estimating what it ought to have been, during the last year, applying the principle suggested to that amount, there should have been exported \$77,766,751 instead of \$47,155,408. If these comparative amounts of the aggregate actual exports and what they ought to have been, be discouraging, we shall find, on descending into particulars, still less cause of satisfaction. The export of tobacco in 1791 was 112,428 hogsheads. That was the year of the largest exportation of that article; but it is the only instance in which I have selected the maximum of exportation. The amount of what we ought to have exported last year, estimated according to the scale of increase which I have used, is 266,332 hogsheads. The actual export was 99,009 hogsheads. We exported in 1803 the quantity of 1,311,853 barrels of flour; and ought to have exported last year 2,361,333 barrels. We, in fact, exported only 756,702 barrels. Of that quantity we sent to South America, according to a statement furnished me by the diligence of a friend near me (Mr.

Poinsett) to whose valuable mass of accurate information, in regard to that interesting quarter of the world, I have had occasion frequently to apply. But that demand is temporary, growing out of the existing state of war. Whenever peace is restored to it, and I now hope that the day is not distant when its independence will be generally acknowledged, there cannot be a doubt that it will supply its own consumption. In all parts of it the soil, either from climate or from elevation, is well adapted to the culture of wheat; and no where can better wheat be produced than in some portions of Mexico and Chili. Still the market of South America is one which, on other accounts, deserves the greatest consideration. And I congratulate you, the committee, and the country, on the recent adoption of a more auspicious policy towards it.

We exported in 1803, Indian corn to the amount of 2,074,608 bushels. The quantity should have been, in 1823, 3,734,288 bushels. The actual quantity exported was 749,034 bushels, or about one-fifth of what it should have been, and a little more than one-third of what it was more than twenty years ago. We ought not then to be surprised at the extreme depression of the price of that article, of which I have heard my honourable friend (Mr. Basset) complain, nor of the distress of the corn-growing districts adjacent to Chesapeake Bay. We exported 77,934 barrels of beef in 1803, and the last year but 61,418, instead of 140,274 barrels. In the same year, (1803,) we exported 96,602 barrels of pork, and last year 55,529, instead of 173,882 barrels. Rice has not advanced, by any means in the proportion which it ought to have done. All the small articles, such as cheese, butter, candles, &c. too minute to detail, but important in their aggregate, have also materially diminished. Cotton alone has advanced. But whilst the quantity of it is augmented, its actual value is considerably diminished. The total quantity last year exceeded that of the preceding year by near thirty millions of pounds. And yet the total value of the year of smaller exportation, exceeded that of the last year by upwards of three and a half millions of dollars. If this article, the capacity of our country to produce which was scarcely known in 1790, were subtracted from the mass of our exports, the value of the residue would only be a little upwards of \$27,000,000, during the last year.

The distribution of the articles of our exports throughout the United States, cannot fail to fix the attention of the Committee. Of the \$47,155,408, to which they amounted last year, three articles alone, (cotton, rice, and tobacco,) composed together \$28,549,177. Now these articles are chiefly produced to the South. And if we estimate that portion of our population who are actually engaged in their culture, it would probably not exceed two millions. Thus, then, less than one-fifth of the whole population of the United States produced upwards of one half, nearly two-thirds, of the entire value of the exports of the last year.

Is this foreign market, so incompetent at present, and which, limited as its demands are, operates so unequally upon the productive labour of our country, likely to improve in future? If I am correct in the views which I have presented to the Committee, it must become worse and worse. What can improve it? Europe will not abandon her own agriculture to foster ours. We may even anticipate that she will more and more enter into competition with us in the supply of the West India market. That of South America, for articles of subsistence, will probably soon vanish. The *value* of our exports, for the future, may remain at about what it was last year. But, if we do not create some new market; if we persevere in the existing pursuits of agriculture, the inevitable consequence must be, to augment greatly the quantity of our produce, and to lessen its value in the foreign market. Can there be a doubt on this point? Take the article of cotton, for example, which is almost the only article that now remunerates labour and capital. A certain description of labour is powerfully attracted towards the cotton growing country. The cultivation will be greatly extended, the aggregate amount, annually produced, will be vastly augmented. The price will fall. The more unsavourable soils will then be gradually abandoned. And I have no doubt that, in a few years, it will cease to be profitably produced, any where north of the 34th degree of latitude. But, in the mean time, large numbers of the cotton-growers will suffer the greatest distress. And whilst this distress is brought upon our own country, foreign industry will be stimulated by the very cause which occasions our distress. For, by surcharging the markets abroad, the price of the raw material being reduced, the manufacturer will be able to supply cotton fabrics cheaper; and the consumption in his own country, and in foreign nations, other than ours, (where the *value* of the import must be limited to the value of the export, which I have supposed to remain the same,) being proportionally extended, there will be consequently an increased demand for the produce of *his* industry.

Our agricultural is our greatest interest. It ought ever to be predominant. All others should bend to it. And in considering what is for its advantage, we should contemplate it in all its varieties, of planting, farming, and grazing. Can we do nothing to invigorate it; nothing to correct the errors of the past, and to brighten the still more unpromising prospects which lie before us?

We have seen, I think, the causes of the distresses of the country. We have seen, that an exclusive dependence upon the foreign market must lead to still severer distress, to impoverishment, to ruin. We must then change somewhat our course. We must give a new direction to some portion of our industry. We must speedily adopt a genuine American policy. Still cherishing the foreign market, let us create also a home market, to give further scope to the consumption of the produce of American industry. Let us counteract the policy of foreigners, and withdraw the support which we now give to their industry, and

stimulate that of our own country. It should be a prominent object with wise legislators, to multiply the vocations and extend the business of society, as far as it can be done, by the protection of our interests at home, against the injurious effects of foreign legislation. Suppose we were a nation of fishermen, or of skippers, to the exclusion of every other occupation, and the legislature had the power to introduce the pursuits of agriculture and manufactures, would not our happiness be promoted by an exertion of its authority? All the existing employments of society—the learned professions—commerce—agriculture, are now overflowing. We stand in each other's way. Hence the want of employment. Hence the eager pursuit after public stations, which I have before glanced at. I have been again and again shocked, during this session, by instances of solicitation for places, before the vacancies existed. The pulse of incumbents, who happen to be taken ill, is not marked with more anxiety by the attending physicians, than by those who desire to succeed them, though with very opposite feelings. Our old friend, the faithful sentinel, who has stood so long at our door, and the gallantry of whose patriotism deserves to be noticed, because it was displayed when that virtue was most rare and most wanted, on a memorable occasion, in this unfortunate city, became indisposed some weeks ago. The first intelligence which I had of his dangerous illness, was by an application for his unvacated place. I hastened to assure myself of the extent of his danger, and was happy to find that the eagerness of succession outstripped the progress of disease. By creating a new and extensive business, then, we should not only give employment to those who want it, and augment the sum of national wealth, by all that this new business would create, but we should meliorate the condition of those who are now engaged in existing employments. In Europe, particularly in Great Britain, their large standing armies, large navies, large even on their peace arrangement, their established church; afford to their population employments, which, in that respect, the happier constitution of our government does not tolerate but in a very limited degree. The peace establishments of our army and our navy, are extremely small, and I hope ever will be. We have no established church, and I trust never shall have. In proportion as the enterprise of our citizens, in public employments, is circumscribed, should we excite and invigorate it in private pursuits.

The creation of a home market is not only necessary to procure for our agriculture a just reward of its labours, but it is indispensable to obtain a supply of our necessary wants. If we cannot sell, we cannot buy. That portion of our population (and we have seen that it is not less than four-fifths) which makes comparatively nothing that foreigners will buy, has nothing to make purchases with, from foreigners. It is in vain that we are told of the amount of our exports supplied by the planting interest. They may enable the planting interest to supply all its wants: but they bring no ability to the interests not planting; unless, which cannot be pretended, the planting interest was an adequate vent for the surplus produce of the labour of all other interests. It is in vain to tantalize us with the greater cheapness of foreign fabrics. There must be an ability to purchase, if an article be obtained, whatever may be the price, high or low, at which it

was sold. And a cheap article is as much beyond the grasp of him who has no means to buy, as a high one. Even if it were true that the American manufacturer would supply consumption at dearer rates, it is better to have his fabrics than the unattainable foreign fabrics; because it is better to be ill supplied than not supplied at all. A coarse coat, which will communicate warmth and cover nakedness, is better than no coat. The superiority of the home market results, 1st, from its steadiness and comparative certainty at all times; 2d, from the creation of reciprocal interests; 3d, from its greater security; And, lastly, from an ultimate and not distant augmentation of consumption (and consequently of comfort) from increased quantity and reduced prices.

~~~~~

But this home market, highly desirable as it is, can only be created and cherished by the **PROTECTION** of our own legislation against the inevitable prostration of our industry, which must ensue from the action of **FOREIGN** policy and legislation. The effect and the value of this domestic care of our own interests will be obvious from a few facts and considerations. Let us suppose that half a million of persons are now employed abroad in fabricating for our consumption, those articles, of which by the operation of this bill a supply is intended to be provided within ourselves. That half a million of persons are, in effect, subsisted by us; but their actual means of subsistence are drawn from foreign agriculture. If we could transport them to this country, and incorporate them in the mass of our own population, there would instantly arise a demand for an amount of provisions equal to that which would be requisite for their subsistence throughout the whole year. That demand, in the article of flour alone, would not be less than the quantity of about 900,000 barrels, besides a proportionate quantity of beef and pork, and other articles of subsistence. But nine hundred thousand barrels of flour exceeded the entire quantity exported last year, by nearly one hundred and fifty thousand barrels. What activity would not this give, what cheerfulness would it not communicate, to our now dispirited farming interest! But if, instead of these 500,000 artisans emigrating from abroad, we give by this bill, employment to an equal number of our own citizens now engaged in unprofitable agriculture, or idle, from the want of business, the beneficial effect upon the productions of our farming labour would be nearly doubled. The quantity would be diminished by a subtraction of the produce from the labour of all those who should be diverted from its pursuits to manufacturing industry, and the value of the residue would be enhanced, both by that diminution and the creation of the home market to the extent supposed. And the honorable gentleman from Virginia, may repress any apprehensions which he entertains, that the plough will be abandoned, and our fields remain unsown. For, under all the modifications of social industry, if you will secure to it a just reward, the greater attractions of agriculture will give to it that proud superiority which it has always maintained.

~~~~~

If we suppose no actual abandonment of farming, but, what is most likely, a gradual and imperceptible employment of population in the business of manufacturing, instead of being compelled to resort to agriculture, the salutary effect would be nearly the same. Is any part of our common country likely to be injured by a transfer of the theatre of fabrication, for our own consumption, from Europe to America? All that those parts, if any there be, which will not or cannot engage in manufactures, should require, is, that their consumption should be well supplied; and if the objects of that consumption are produced in other parts of the Union, that can manufacture, far from having on that account, any just cause of complaint, their patriotism will and ought to inculcate a cheerful acquiescence in what essentially contributes, *and is indispensable necessary*, to the prosperity of the common family.

The great desideratum in political economy, is the same as in private pursuits; that is, What is the best application of the aggregate industry of a nation, that can be made honestly to produce the largest sum of national wealth? Labour is the source of all wealth; but it is not natural labour only.

And the fundamental error of the gentleman from Virginia, and of the school to which he belongs, in deducing, from our sparse population, our unsuitess for the introduction of the arts, consists in their not sufficiently weighing the importance of the power of machinery. In former times, when but little comparative use was made of machinery, manual labour, and the price of wages, were circumstances of the greatest consideration. But it is far otherwise in these latter times. Such are the improvements and the perfection in machinery, that, in analyzing the compound value of many fabrics, the element of natural labour is so inconsiderable as almost to escape detection. This truth is demonstrated by many facts. Formerly Asia, in consequence of the density of her population, and the consequent lowness of wages, laid Europe under tribute for many of her fabrics. Now Europe reacts upon Asia, and Great Britain in particular, throws back upon her countless millions of people, the rich treasures produced by artificial labour, to a vast amount, infinitely cheaper than they can be manufactured by the natural exertions of that portion of the globe,

But Britain is herself the most striking illustration of the immense power of machinery. Upon what other principle can you account for the enormous wealth which she has accumulated, and which she annually produces? A statistical writer of that country, several years ago, estimated the total amount of the artificial or machine labour of the nation, to be equal to that of one hundred millions of able-bodied labourers. Subsequent estimates of her artificial labour, at the present day, carry it to the enormous height of two hundred millions. But the population of the three kingdoms is 21,500,000. Supposing that to furnish able-bodied la-

bour to the amount of four millions, the natural labour will be but two per cent. of the artificial labour. In the production of wealth she operates, therefore, by a power (including the whole population) of 221,500,000; or, in other words, by a power eleven times greater than the total of her natural power. If we suppose the machine labour of the United States to be equal to that of 10,000,000 of able-bodied men, the United States will operate, in the creation of wealth, by a power (including all their population) of 20,000,000. In the creation of wealth, therefore, the power of Great Britain, compared to that of the United States, is as eleven to one. That these views are not imaginary, will be, I think, evinced, by contrasting the wealth, the revenue, the power of the two countries. Upon what other hypothesis can we explain those almost incredible exertions which Britain made during the late wars of Europe? Look at her immense subsidies! Behold her standing, unaided and alone, and breasting the storm of Napoleon's colossal power, when all continental Europe owned and yielded to its irresistible sway; and finally contemplate her vigorous prosecution of the war, with and without allies, to its splendid termination, on the ever memorable field of Waterloo!

The British works which the gentleman from Virginia has quoted, portray a state of the most wonderful prosperity, in regard to wealth and resources, that ever was before contemplated. Let us look a little into the semi-official pamphlet, written with great force, clearness, and ability, and the valuable work of Lowe, to both of which that gentleman has referred. The revenue of the United Kingdom amounted, during the latter years of the war, to seventy millions of pounds sterling; and one year it rose to the astonishing height of ninety millions sterling, equal to four hundred millions of dollars. This was actual revenue, made up of real contributions, from the purses of the people. After the close of the war, ministers slowly and reluctantly reduced the military and naval establishments, and accommodated them to a state of peace. The pride of power, every where the same, always unwillingly surrenders any of those circumstances, which display its pomp, and exhibit its greatness. Cotemporaneous with this reduction, Britain was enabled to lighten some of the heaviest burthens of taxation, and particularly that most onerous of all, the *income tax*. In this lowered state, the revenue of peace, gradually rising from the momentary depression incident to a transition from war, attained, in 1822, the vast amount of fifty-five millions sterling, upwards of two hundred and forty millions of dollars, and more than eleven times that of the United States for the same year; thus indicating the difference, which I have suggested, in the respective productive powers of the two countries. The excise alone (collected under twenty-five different heads) amounted to twenty-eight millions, more than one half of the total revenue of the kingdom. This great revenue allows Great Britain to constitute an efficient sinking fund of five millions sterling, being an excess of actual income beyond expenditure, and amounting to more than the entire revenue of the United States.

If we look at the commerce of England, we shall perceive that its prosperous condition no less denotes the immensity of her riches. The average of three years exports, ending in 1789, was between 13 and 14 millions. The average for the same term ending in 1822, was 40 millions sterling. The average of the imports for three years, ending in 1789, was seventeen millions. The average for the same term, ending in 1822, was thirty-six millions, showing a favourable balance of four millions. Thus, in a period not longer than that which has elapsed since the establishment of our constitution, have the exports of that kingdom been tripled; and this has mainly been the effect of the power of machinery. The total amount of the commerce of Great Britain is greater since the peace, by one-fourth, than it was during the war. The average of her tonnage, during the most flourishing period of the war, was two million four hundred thousand tons. Its average, during the three years, 1819, 1820, and 1821, was 2,600,000; exhibiting an increase of 200,000 tons. If we glance at some of the more prominent articles of her manufactures, we shall be assisted in comprehending the true nature of the sources of her riches. The amount of cotton fabrics exported, in the most prosperous year of the war, was eighteen million sterling. In the year 1820, it was 16,600,000; in 1821, 21,500,000; in 1822, 21,639,000*l.* sterling; presenting the astonishing increase in two years of upwards of five millions. The total amount of imports in Great Britain from all foreign parts, of the article of cotton wool, is five millions sterling. After supplying most abundantly the consumption of cotton fabrics within the country (and a people better fed and clad and housed, are not to be found under the sun, than the British nation,) by means of her industry, she gives to this cotton wool a new value, which enables her to sell to foreign nations to the amount of 21,639,000*l.* making a clear profit of upwards of 16,500,000*l.* sterling! In 1821, the value of the export of woollen manufactures was 4,300,000*l.* In 1822, it was 5,500,000*l.* The success of her restrictive policy is strikingly illustrated in the article of silk. In the manufacture of that article she labours under great disadvantages, besides that of not producing the raw material. She has subdued them all, and the increase of the manufacture has been most rapid. Although she is still unable to maintain, in foreign countries, a successful competition with the silks of France, of India, and of Italy, and therefore exports but little, she gives to the two millions of the raw material which she imports, in various forms, a value of ten millions, which chiefly enter into British consumption. Let us suppose that she was dependent upon foreign nations for these ten millions, what an injurious effect would it not have upon her commercial relations with them? The average of the exports of British manufactures, during the peace, exceeds the average of the most productive years of the war. The amount of her wealth annually produced, is three hundred and fifty millions sterling; bearing a large proportion to all of her pre-existing wealth. The agricultural portion of it is said by the gentleman from Virginia, to be greater than that

created by any other branch of her industry. But that flows mainly from a policy similar to that proposed by this bill. One-third only of her population is engaged in agriculture; the other two-thirds furnishing a market for the produce of that third. Withdraw this market, and what becomes of her agriculture? The power and the wealth of Great Britain cannot be more strikingly illustrated, than by a comparison of her population and revenue with those of other countries and with our own. [Here Mr. Clay exhibited the following table, made out from authentic materials.]

	<i>Population.</i>	<i>Taxes and public burthens</i>	<i>Taxation per capita</i>
Russia in Europe,	37,000,000	£18,000,000	£0 9 9
France, including Corsica,	30,700,000	£37,000,000	£1 4 0
Great Britain, exclusive of Ireland (the taxes computed according to the value of money on the European Continent,)	14,500,000	£40,000,000	£2 15 0
Great Britain and Ireland collectively,	21,500,000	£44,000,000	£2 0 0
England alone,	11,600,000	£36,000,000	£3 2 0
Spain,	11,000,000	£6,000,000	£0 11 0
Ireland,	7,000,000	£4,000,000	£0 11 0
The United States of America,	10,000,000	£4,500,000	£0 9 0

From this exhibit we must remark, that the wealth of Great Britain, (and consequently her power,) is greater than that of any of the other nations with which it is compared. The amount of the contributions which she draws from the pockets of her subjects, is not referred to for imitation, but as indicative of their wealth. The burthen of taxation is always relative to the ability of the subjects of it. A poor nation can pay but little. And the heavier taxes of British subjects, for example, in consequence of their greater wealth, may be easier borne than the much lighter taxes of Spanish subjects, in consequence of their extreme poverty. The object of wise governments should be, by sound legislation, so to protect the industry of their own citizens against the policy of foreign powers, as to give to it the most expansive force in the production of wealth. Great Britain has ever acted, and still acts, on this policy. She has pushed her protection of British interest further than any other nation has fostered its industry. The result is, greater wealth among her subjects, and consequently greater ability to pay their public burthens.

If their taxation is estimated by their *natural* labour alone, nominally it is greater than the taxation of the subjects of any other power. But if on a scale of their national and artificial labour compounded, it is less than the taxation of any other people. Estimating it on that scale, and assuming the aggregate of the natural and artificial labour of the United Kingdom to be what I have already stated, 221,500,000, the actual taxes paid by a British subject are only about three and seven-pence sterling. Estimating our own taxes, on a simi-

lar scale,—that is, supposing both descriptions of labour to be equal to that of 20,000,000 of able-bodied persons,—the amount of tax paid by each soul in the United States is 4s. 6d. sterling.

The Committee will observe, from that table, that the measure of the wealth of a nation is indicated by the measure of its protection of its industry; and that the measure of the poverty of a nation is marked by that of the degree in which it neglects and abandons the care of its own industry, leaving it exposed to the action of foreign powers. Great Britain protects most her industry, and the wealth of Great Britain is consequently the greatest. France is next in the degree of protection, and France is next in the order of wealth. Spain most neglects the duty of protecting the industry of her subjects, and Spain is one of the poorest of European nations. Unfortunate Ireland, disinherited, or rendered in her industry subservient to England, is exactly in the same state of poverty with Spain, measured by the rule of taxation. And the United States are still poorer than either.

The views of British prosperity, which I have endeavoured to present, show that her protecting policy is adapted alike to a state of war and of peace. Self-poised, resting upon her own internal resources, possessing a home market, carefully cherished and guarded, she is ever prepared for any emergency. We have seen her coming out of a war of incalculable exertion, and of great duration, with her power unbroken, her means undiminished. We have seen, that almost every revolving year of peace has brought along with it an increase of her manufactures, of her commerce, and, consequently, of her navigation. We have seen that, constructing her prosperity upon the solid foundation of her own protecting policy, it is unaffected by the vicissitudes of other states. What is our own condition? Depending upon the state of foreign powers—confiding exclusively in a foreign, to the culpable neglect of a domestic, policy—our interests are affected by all their movements. Their wars, their misfortunes, are the only source of our prosperity. In their peace, and our peace, we behold our condition the reverse of that of Great Britain—and all our interests, stationary or declining.—Peace brings to us none of the blessings of peace. Our system is anomalous; alike unfitted to general tranquillity, and to a state of war or peace on the part of our own country. It can succeed only in the rare occurrence of a general state of war throughout Europe. I am no eulogist of England. I am far from recommending her systems of taxation. I have adverted to them only as manifesting her extraordinary ability.

The political and foreign interests of that nation may have been, as I believe them to have been, often badly managed. Had she abstained from the wars into which she has been plunged by her ambition, or the mistaken policy of her ministers, the prosperity of England would, unquestionably, have been much greater. But it may happen that the

public liberty, and the foreign relations of a nation, have been badly provided for, and yet that its political economy has been wisely managed. The alacrity or sullenness with which a people pay taxes, depends upon their wealth or poverty. If the system of their rulers leads to their impoverishment, they can contribute but little to the necessities of the state;—if to their wealth, they cheerfully and promptly pay the burthens imposed on them. Enormous as British taxation appears to be, in comparison with that of other nations, but really lighter, as it in fact is, when we consider its great wealth, and its powers of production, that vast amount is collected with the most astonishing regularity. [Here Mr. Clay read certain passages from Holt, showing that, in 1822, there was not a solitary prosecution arising out of the collection of the assessed taxes, which are there considered among the most burthensome, and that the prosecutions for violations of the excise laws, in all its numerous branches, were sensibly and progressively decreasing.]

Having called the attention of the Committee to the present adverse state of our country, and endeavoured to point out the causes which have led to it; having shown that similar causes, wherever they exist in other countries, lead to the same adversity in their condition; and having shown that, wherever we find opposite causes prevailing, a high and animating state of national prosperity exists, the Committee will agree with me in thinking that it is the solemn duty of government to apply a remedy to the evils which afflict our country, if it can apply one. Is there no remedy within the reach of the government? Are we doomed to behold our industry languish and decay, yet more and more? But there is a remedy, and that remedy consists in modifying our foreign policy, and in adopting a genuine AMERICAN SYSTEM. We must naturalize the arts in our country; and we must naturalize them by the only means which the wisdom of nations has yet discovered to be effectual; by adequate protection, against the otherwise overwhelming influence of foreigners. This is only to be accomplished by the establishment of a tariff, to the consideration of which I am now brought.

And what is this tariff? It seems to have been regarded as a sort of monster, huge and deformed—a wild beast, endowed with tremendous powers of destruction, about to be let loose among our people—if not to devour them, at least to consume their substance. But let us calm our passions, and deliberately survey this alarming, this terrific being. The sole object of the tariff is to tax the produce of foreign industry, with the view of promoting American industry. The tax is exclusively levelled at foreign industry. That is the avowed and the direct purpose of the tariff. If it subjects any part of American industry to burthens, that is an effect not intended, but is altogether incidental, and perfectly voluntary.

It has been treated as an imposition of burthens upon one part of the community by design, for the benefit of another; as if, in fact, money were taken from the pockets of one portion of the people and put into the pockets of another. But, is that a fair re-

presentation of it? No man pays the duty assessed on the foreign article by compulsion, but voluntarily; and this voluntary duty, if paid, goes into the common exchequer, for the common benefit of all. Consumption has four objects of choice. 1. It may abstain from the use of the foreign article, and thus avoid the payment of the tax. 2. It may employ the rival American fabric. 3. It may engage in the business of manufacturing, which this bill is designed to foster. 4. Or it may supply itself from the household manufactures.

But it is said, by the honourable gentleman from Virginia, that the South, owing to the character of a certain portion of its population, cannot engage in the business of manufacturing. Now I do not agree in that opinion, to the extent in which it is asserted. The circumstance alluded to may disqualify the South from engaging, in every branch of manufacture, as largely as other quarters of the Union, but to some branches of it, that part of our population is well adapted. It indisputably affords great facility in the household or domestic line. But, if the gentleman's premises were true, could his conclusion be admitted? According to him, a certain part of our population, happily much the smallest, is peculiarly situated.

The circumstance of its degradation unfits it for the manufacturing arts. The well being of the other, and the larger part of our population, requires the introduction of those arts. What is to be done in this conflict? The gentleman would have us abstain from adopting a policy called for by the interest of the greater and freer part of our population. But is that reasonable? Can it be expected that the interests of the greater part should be made to bend to the condition of the servile part of our population? That, in effect, would be to make us the slaves of slaves. I went, with great pleasure, along with my southern friends, and I am ready again to unite with them in protesting against the exercise of any legislative power, on the part of Congress, over that delicate subject, because it was my solemn conviction, that Congress was interdicted, or at least not authorized, by the constitution, to exercise any such legislative power. And I am sure that the patriotism of the South may be exclusively relied upon to reject a policy which should be dictated by considerations altogether connected with that degraded class, to the prejudice of the residue of our population. But does not a perseverance in the foreign policy, as it now exists, in fact make all parts of the Union, not planting, tributary to the planting parts?

What is the argument? It is, that we must continue freely to receive the produce of foreign industry, without regard to the protection of American industry, that a market may be retained for the sale abroad of the produce of the planting portion of the country; and that if we lessen the consumption, in all parts of America, those which are not planting, as well as the planting sections, of foreign manufactures, we

diminish to that extent the foreign market for the planting produce. The existing state of things, indeed, presents a sort of tacit compact between the cotton grower and the British manufacturer, the stipulations of which are, on the part of the cotton grower, that the whole of the United States, the other portions as well as the cotton growing, shall remain open and unrestricted in the consumption of British manufactures; and, on the part of the British manufacturer that, in consideration thereof, he will continue to purchase the cotton of the South. Thus, then, we perceive that the proposed measure, instead of sacrificing the South to the other parts of the Union, seeks only to preserve them from being absolutely sacrificed under the operation of the tacit compact which I have described. Supposing the South to be actually incompetent, or disinclined to embark at all in the business of manufacturing, is not its interest, nevertheless, likely to be promoted by creating a new and an American source of supply for its consumption? Now foreign powers, and Great Britain principally, have the monopoly of the supply of southern consumption. If this bill should pass, an American competitor in the supply of the South would be raised up, and ultimately I cannot doubt that it will be supplied cheaper and better. I have before had occasion to state, and will now again mention, the beneficial effects of American competition with Europe in furnishing a supply of the article of cotton bagging. After the late war, the influx of the Scottish manufacture prostrated the American establishments. The consequence was that the Scotch possessed the monopoly of the supply; and the price of it rose, and attained, the year before the last, a height which amounted to more than an equivalent for ten years protection to the American manufacture. This circumstance tempted American industry again to engage in the business, and several valuable manufactories have been established in Kentucky. They have reduced the price of the fabric very considerably; but without the protection of government they may be again prostrated—and then the Scottish manufacturer engrossing the supply of our consumption, the price will probably again rise. It has been tauntingly asked if Kentucky cannot maintain herself in a competition with the two Scottish towns of Inverness and Dundee? But is that a fair statement of the case? Those two towns are cherished and sustained by the whole protecting policy of the British empire, whilst Kentucky cannot, and the general government will not, extend a like protection to the few Kentucky villages in which the article is made.

If the cotton growing consumption could be constitutionally exempted from the operation of this bill, it might be fair to exempt it upon the condition that foreign manufactures, the proceeds of the sale of cotton abroad, should not enter at all into the consumption of the other parts of the United States. But such an arrangement as that, if it could be made, would probably be objected to by the cotton growing country itself.

2. The second objection to the proposed bill is, that it will diminish the amount of our exports. It can have no effect upon our exports, except those which are sent to Europe. Except tobacco and rice, we send there nothing but the raw materials. The argument is, that Europe will not buy of us, if we do not buy of her. The first objection

to it is, that it calls upon us to look to the question, and to take care of European ability in legislating for American interests. Now, if in legislating for their interests, they would consider and provide for our ability, the principle of reciprocity would enjoin us so to regulate our intercourse with them, as to leave their ability unimpaired. But I have shown that, in the adoption of their own policy, their inquiry is strictly limited to a consideration of their peculiar interests, without any regard to that of ours. The next remark I would make is, that the bill only operates upon *certain* articles of European industry, which it is supposed our interest requires us to manufacture within ourselves; and although its effect will be to diminish the amount of our imports of *those* articles, it leaves them free to supply us with any other produce of their industry. And since the circle of human comforts, refinements, and luxuries, is of great extent, Europe will still find herself able to purchase from us what she has hitherto done, and to discharge the debt in some of those objects. If there be any diminution in our exports to Europe, it will probably be in the article of cotton to Great Britain. I have stated that Britain buys cotton wool to the amount of about five millions sterling, and sells to foreign states to the amount of upwards of 21,000,000 and a half. Of this sum, we take a little upwards of a million and a half. The residue of about 20,000,000, she must sell to other foreign powers than the United States. Now their market will continue open to her, as much after the passage of this bill, as before. She will therefore require from us the raw material to supply their consumption. But, it is said, she may refuse to purchase it of us, and seek a supply elsewhere. There can be but little doubt that she now resorts to us, because we can supply her cheaper and better than any other country. And it would be unreasonable to suppose that she would cease, from any pique towards us, to pursue her own interest. Suppose she was to decline purchasing from us: The consequence would be, that she would lose the market for the twenty millions sterling, which she now sells other foreign powers, or enter it under a disadvantageous competition with us, or with other nations, who should obtain their supplies of the raw material from us. If there should be any diminution, therefore, in the exportation of cotton, it would only be in the proportion of about one and a half to twenty, that is, a little upwards of five per cent.; the loss of a market for which, abroad, would be fully compensated by the market for the article created at home. Lastly, I would observe, that the new application of our industry, producing new objects of exportation, and they possessing much greater value than in the raw state, we should be in the end amply indemnified, by their exportation. Already the item in our foreign exports of manufactures is considerable; and we know that our cotton fabrics have been recently exported in a large amount to South America, where they maintain a successful competition with those of any other country.

3. The third objection to the tariff is, that it will diminish our navigation. This great interest deserves every encouragement, consistent with the paramount interest of agriculture. In the order of nature it is secondary to both agriculture and manufactures. Its business is the transportation of the productions of those two superior branches of industry. It cannot therefore be expected, that they shall be moulded or

sacrificed to suit its purposes ; but, on the contrary, navigation must accommodate itself, to the actual state of agriculture and manufactures. If, as I believe, we have nearly reached the maximum in value of our exports of raw produce to Europe, the effect hereafter will be, as it respects that branch of our trade, if we persevere in the foreign system, to retain our navigation at the point which it has now reached. By reducing, indeed, as will probably take place, the price of our raw materials, a further quantity of them could be exported, and, of course, additional employment might, in that way, be given to our tonnage ; but that would be at the expense of the agricultural interest. If I am right in supposing that no effect will be produced by this measure upon any other branch of our export trade, but that to Europe ; that, with regard to that, there will be no sensible diminution of our exports ; and that the new direction given to a portion of our industry will produce other objects of exportation, the probability is, that our foreign tonnage will be even increased under the operation of this bill. But, if I am mistaken in these views, and it should experience any reduction, the increase in our coasting tonnage, resulting from the greater activity of domestic exchanges, will more than compensate the injury. Although our navigation partakes in the general distress of the country, it is less depressed than any other of our great interests. The foreign tonnage has been gradually, though slowly, increasing, since 1818. And our coasting tonnage, since 1816, has increased upwards of one hundred thousand tons.

4. It is next contended that the effect of the measure will be to diminish our foreign commerce. The objection assumes, what I have endeavoured to controvert, that there will be a reduction in the value of our exports. Commerce is an exchange of commodities. Whatever will tend to augment the wealth of a nation must increase its capacity to make these exchanges. By new productions, or creating new values in the fabricated forms which shall be given to old objects of our industry, we shall give to commerce a fresh spring, a new aliment. The foreign commerce of the country, from causes, some of which I have endeavoured to point out, has been extended as far as it can be. And I think there can be but little doubt that the balance of trade is, and for some time past has been, against us. I was surprised to hear the learned gentleman from Massachusetts, (Mr. Webster,) rejecting, as a detected and exploded fallacy, the idea of a balance of trade. I have not time nor inclination now to discuss that topic. But I will observe, that all nations act upon the supposition of the reality of its existence, and seek to avoid a trade, the balance of which is unfavourable, and to foster that which presents a favourable, balance. However the account be made up, whatever may be the items of a trade, comodities, fishing industry, marine labour, the carrying trade, all of which I admit should be comprehended, there can be no doubt, I think, that the totality of the exchanges of all descriptions made by one nation with another, or against the totality of the exchanges of all other nations together, may be such as to present the state of an unfavorable balance with the one or with all. It is true that, in the long run, the measures of these exchanges, that is, the totality in value of what is given and of what is received, must be equal to each other. But great

distress may be felt long before the counterpoise can be effected. In the mean time, there will be an export of the precious metals, to the deep injury of internal trade, an unfavorable state of exchange, an export of public securities, a resort to credit, debt, mortgages. Most of, if not all, these circumstances, are believed now to be indicated by our country, in its foreign commercial relations. What have we received, for example, for the public stocks sent to England? Goods. But those stocks are our bond, which must be paid. Although the solidity of the credit of the English public securities is not surpassed by that of our own, strong as it justly is, when have we seen English stocks sold in our market, and regularly quoted in the prices current, as American stocks are in England? An unfavorable balance with one nation, *may* be made up by a favorable balance with other nations; but the fact of the existence of that unfavorable balance is strong presumptive evidence against the trade. Commerce will regulate itself! Yes, and the extravagance of a spendthrift heir, who squanders the rich patrimony which has descended to him, will regulate itself ultimately. But it will be a regulation which will exhibit him in the end safety confined within the walls of a jail. Commerce will regulate itself! But is it not the duty of wise governments to watch its course, and, beforehand, to provide against even distant evils; by prudent legislation stimulating the industry of their own people, and checking the policy of foreign powers as it operates on them? The supply, then, of the subjects of foreign commerce, no less than the supply of consumption at home, requires of us to give a portion of our labour such a direction as will enable us to produce them. That is the object of the measure under consideration, and I cannot doubt that, if adopted, it will accomplish its object.

5. The fifth objection to the tariff, is, that it will diminish the public revenue, disable us from paying the public debt, and finally compel a resort to a system of excise and internal taxation. This objection is founded upon the supposition that the reduction in the importation of the subjects, on which the increased duties are to operate, will be such as to produce the alleged effect. All this is matter of mere conjecture, and can only be determined by experiment. I have very little doubt, with my colleague, (Mr. Trimble,) that the revenue will be increased considerably, for some years at least, under the operation of this bill. The diminution in the quantity imported will be compensated by the augmentation of the duty. In reference to the article of molasses, for example, if the import of it should be reduced fifty per cent. the amount of duty collected would be the same as it now is. But it will not, in all probability, be reduced by any thing like that proportion. And then there are some other articles which will continue to be introduced in as large quantities as ever, notwithstanding the increase of duty, the object in reference to them being revenue and not the encouragement of domestic manufactures. Another cause will render the revenue of this year, in particular, much more productive than it otherwise would have been; and that is, that large quantities of goods have been introduced into the country, in anticipation of the adoption of this measure. The eagle does not dart a keener gaze upon his intended prey, than that with which the British manufacturer and merchant watches the foreign market, and the course even of our elections as well as our legislation.

The passage of this bill has been expected; and all our information is that the importations, during this spring, have been immense. But, further, the measure of our importations is that of our exportations. If I am right in supposing, that, in future, the amount of these in the old or new forms of the produce of our labour will not be diminished, but probably increased, then the amount of our importations, and consequently, of our revenue, will not be reduced, but may be extended. If these ideas be correct, there will be no inability on the part of government to extinguish the public debt. The payment of that debt, and the consequent liberation of the public resources from the charge of it, is extremely desirable. No one is more anxious than I am to see that important object accomplished. But I entirely concur with the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Barbour,) in thinking that no material sacrifice of any of the great interests of the nation ought to be made to effectuate it. Such is the elastic and accumulating nature of our public resources, from the silent augmentation of our population, that, if in any given state of the public revenue, we throw ourselves upon a couch and go to sleep, we may, after a short time, awake with an ability abundantly increased to redeem any reasonable amount of public debt with which we may happen to be burthened. The public debt of the United States, though nominally larger now than it was in the year 1791, bears really no sort of discouraging comparison to its amount at that time, whatever standard we may choose to adopt to institute the comparison. It was in 1791 about seventy-five millions of dollars. It is now about ninety. Then we had a population of about four millions. Now we have upwards of ten millions. Then we had a revenue short of five millions of dollars. Now our revenue exceeds twenty. If we select population as the standard, our present population is one hundred and fifty per cent. greater than it was in 1791; if revenue, that is four times more now than at the former period; whilst the public debt has increased only in a ratio of twenty per cent. A public debt of three hundred millions of dollars, at the present day, considering our actual ability, compounded both of the increase of population and of revenue, would not be more onerous now than the debt of seventy-five millions of dollars was, at the epoch of 1791, in reference to the same circumstances. If I am right in supposing, that, under the operation of the proposed measure, there will not be any diminution, but a probable increase of the public revenue, there will be no difficulty in defraying the current expenses of government, and paying the principal, as well as the interest, of the public debt, as it becomes due. Let us for a moment, however, indulge the improbable supposition of the opponents of the tariff, that there will be a reduction of the revenue to the extent of the most extravagant calculation which has been made, that is to say, to the extent of five millions. That sum deducted, we shall still have remaining a revenue of about fifteen millions. The treasury estimates of the current service of the years 1822, 1823, and 1824, exceeds, each year, nine millions. The lapse of revolutionary pensions, and judicious retrenchments which might be made without detriment to any of the essential establishments of the country, would probably reduce them below nine millions. Let us assume that sum, to which add about five millions and a half for the interest of the public debt, and the wants of

government would require a revenue of fourteen and a half millions, leaving a surplus of revenue of half a million beyond the public expenditure. Thus, by a postponement of the payment of the principal of the public debt, in which the public creditors would gladly acquiesce, and confiding for the means of redeeming it in the necessary increase of our revenue from the natural augmentation of our population and consumption, we may safely adopt the proposed measure, even if it should be attended (which is confidently denied) with the supposed diminution of revenue. We shall not then have occasion to vary the existing system of taxation; we shall be under no necessity to resort either to direct taxes or to an excise. But, suppose the alternative were really forced upon us of continuing the foreign system, with its inevitable impoverishment of the country, but with the advantage of the present mode of collecting the taxes, or of adopting the American system, with its increase of the national wealth, but with the disadvantage of an excise, could any one hesitate between them? Customs and an excise agree in the essential particulars, that they are both taxes upon consumption, and both are voluntary. They differ only in the mode of collection. The office for the collection of one is located on the frontier, and that for the other within the interior. I believe it was Mr. Jefferson, who, in reply to the boast of a citizen of New-York of the amount of the public revenue paid by that city, asked who would pay it if the collector's office were removed to Paulus Hook, on the New-Jersey shore? National wealth is the source of all taxation. And, my word for it, the people are too intelligent to be deceived by mere names, and not to give a decided preference to that system which is based upon their wealth and prosperity, rather than to that which is founded upon their impoverishment and ruin.

6. But, according to the opponents of the domestic policy, the proposed system will force capital and labour into new and reluctant employments; we are not prepared, in consequence of the high price of wages, for the successful establishment of manufactures, and we must fail in the experiment. We have seen, that the existing occupations of our society, those of agriculture, commerce, navigation, and the learned professions, are overflowing with competitors, and that the want of employment is severely felt. Now what does this bill propose? To open a new and extensive field of business, in which all that choose may enter. There is no compulsion upon any one to engage in it. An option only is given to industry, to continue in the present unprofitable pursuits, or to embark in a new and promising one. The effect will be to lessen the competition in the old branches of business, and to multiply our resources for increasing our comforts, and augmenting the national wealth. The alleged fact of the high price of wages is not admitted. The truth is, that no class of society suffers more, in the present stagnation of business, than the labouring class. That is a necessary effect of the depression of agriculture, the principal business of the community. The wages of able-bodied men vary from five to eight dollars per month; and such has been the want of employment, in some parts of the Union, that instances have not been unfrequent, of men working merely for the means of present subsistence. If the wages for labour here and in England are compared, they will be found not to be

essentially different. I agree with the honourable gentleman from Virginia, that high wages are a proof of national prosperity; we differ only in the means by which that desirable end shall be attained. But, if the fact were true, that the wages of labour are high, I deny the correctness of the argument founded upon it. The argument assumes that natural labour is the principal element in the business of manufacture. That was the ancient theory. But the valuable inventions and vast improvements in machinery, which have been made within a few past years, have produced a new era in the arts. The effect of this change, in the powers of production, may be estimated from what I have already stated, in relation to England, and to the triumphs of European artificial labour over the natural labour of Asia. In considering the fitness of a nation for the establishment of manufactures, we must no longer limit our views to the state of its population, and the price of wages. All circumstances must be regarded, of which that is, perhaps, the least important. Capital, ingenuity in the construction, and adroitness in the use of machinery, and the possession of the raw materials, are those which deserve the greatest consideration. All these circumstances, (except that of capital, of which there is no deficiency,) exist in our country in an eminent degree, and more than counterbalance the disadvantage, if it really existed, of the lower wages of labour in Great Britain. The dependence upon foreign nations for the raw material of any great manufacture, has been ever considered as a discouraging fact. The state of our population is peculiarly favourable to the most extensive introduction of machinery. We have no prejudices to combat, no persons to drive out of employment. The pamphlet, to which we have had occasion so often to refer, in enumerating the causes which have brought in England their manufactures to such a state of perfection, and which now enable them, in the opinion of the writer, to defy all competition, does not specify, as one of them, low wages. It assigns three—1st, capital; 2dly, extent and costliness of machinery; and, 3dly, steady and persevering industry. Notwithstanding the concurrence of so many favourable causes, in our country, for the introduction of the arts, we are earnestly dissuaded from making the experiment, and our ultimate failure is confidently predicted. Why should we fail? Nations, like men, fail in nothing which they boldly attempt, when sustained by virtuous purpose, and firm resolution. I am not willing to admit this depreciation of American skill and enterprize. I am not willing to strike before an effort is made. All our past history exhorts us to proceed, and inspires us with animating hopes of success. Past predictions of our incapacity have failed, and present predictions will not be realized. At the commencement of this government, we were told that the attempt would be idle to construct a marine adequate to the commerce of the country, or even to the business of its coasting trade. The founders of our government did not listen to these discouraging counsels; and, behold the fruits of their just comprehension of our resources! Our restrictive policy was denounced, and it was foretold that it would utterly disappoint all our expectations. But our restrictive policy has been eminently successful; and the share which our navigation now enjoys in the trade with France, and with the British West-India islands, attests its victory. What were not the dishearten-

ing predictions of the opponents of the late war? Defeat, discomfiture, and disgrace, were to be the certain, but not the worst, effect of it. Here, again, did prophecy prove false; and the energies of our country, and the valour and the patriotism of our people, carried us gloriously through the war. We are now, and ever will be, essentially, an agricultural people. Without a material change in the fixed habits of the country, the friends of this measure desire to draw to it, as a powerful auxiliary to its industry, the manufacturing arts. The difference between a nation with, and without the arts, may be conceived, by the difference between a keel-boat and a steam-boat, combating the rapid torrent of the Mississippi. How slow does the former ascend, hugging the sinuosities of the shore, pushed on by her hardy and exposed crew, now throwing themselves in vigorous concert on their oars, and then seizing the pendent boughs of overhanging trees: she seems hardly to move; and her scanty cargo is scarcely worth the transportation! With what ease is she not passed by the steam-boat, laden with the riches of all quarters of the world, with a crowd of gay, cheerful, and protected passengers, now dashing into the midst of the current, or gliding through the eddies near the shore! Nature herself seems to survey, with astonishment, the passing wonder, and, in silent submission, reluctantly to own the magnificent triumphs, in her own vast dominion, of Fulton's immortal genius!

7. But it is said, that, wherever there is a concurrence of favourable circumstances, manufactures will arise of themselves, without protection; and that we should not disturb the natural progress of industry, but leave things to themselves. If all nations would modify their policy on this axiom, perhaps it would be better for the common good of the whole. Even then, in consequence of natural advantages and a greater advance in civilization and in the arts, some nations would enjoy a state of much higher prosperity than others. But there is no universal legislation. The globe is divided into different communities, each seeking to appropriate to itself all the advantages it can, without reference to the prosperity of others. Whether this is right or not, it has always been, and ever will be, the case. Perhaps the care of the interests of one people, is sufficient for all the wisdom of one legislature; and that it is among nations, as among individuals, that the happiness of the whole is best secured by each attending to its own peculiar interests. The proposition to be maintained by our adversaries, is that manufactures, without protection, will in due time spring up in our country, and sustain themselves, in a competition with foreign fabrics, however advanced the arts, and whatever the degree of protection may be in foreign countries. Now I contend that this proposition is refuted by all experience, ancient and modern, and in every country. If I am asked, why unprotected industry should not succeed in a struggle with protected industry, I answer, the **FACT** has ever been so, and that is sufficient; I reply, that **UNIFORM EXPERIENCE** evinces that it cannot succeed in such an unequal contest, and that is sufficient. If we speculate on the causes of this universal truth, we may differ about them. Still the indisputable fact remains. And we should be as unwise in not availing ourselves of the guide which it furnishes, as a man would be who should refuse to bask in the rays of the sun, because he could not agree

with Judge Woodward as to the nature of the substance of that planet, to which we are indebted for heat and light. If I were to attempt to particularize the causes which prevent the success of the manufacturing arts, without protection, I should say, that they are—1st, the obduracy of fixed habits. No nation, no individual, will easily change an established course of business, even if it be unprofitable; and least of all is an agricultural people prone to innovation. With what reluctance do they not adopt improvements in the instruments of husbandry, or in modes of cultivation! If the farmer makes a good crop, and sells it badly; or makes a short crop; buoyed up by hope he perseveres, and trusts that a favourable change of the market, or of the seasons, will enable him, in the succeeding year, to repair the misfortunes of the past. 2dly, The uncertainty, fluctuation, and unsteadiness of the home market, when liable to an unrestricted influx of fabrics from all foreign nations; and 3dly, The superior advance of skill, and amount of capital, which foreign nations have obtained, by the protection of their own industry. From the latter, or from other causes, the unprotected manufactures of a country are exposed to the danger of being crushed in their infancy, either by the design or from the necessities of foreign manufacturers. Gentlemen are incredulous as to the attempts of foreign merchants and manufacturers to accomplish the destruction of ours. Why should they not make such attempts? If the Scottish manufacturer, by surcharging our market, in one year, with the article of cotton bagging, for example, should so reduce the price as to discourage and put down the home manufacture, he would secure to himself the monopoly of the supply. And now having the exclusive possession of the market, perhaps for a long term of years, he might be more than indemnified for his first loss, in the subsequent rise in the price of the article. What have we not seen under our own eyes! The competition for the transportation of the mail, between this place and Baltimore, so excited, that, to obtain it, an individual offered, at great loss, to carry it a whole year for one dollar! His calculation, no doubt, was, that by driving his competitor off the road, and securing to himself the carriage of the mail, he would be afterwards able to repair his original loss by new contracts with the department. But the necessities of foreign manufacturers, without imputing to them any sinister design, may oblige them to throw into our markets the fabrics which have accumulated on their hands, in consequence of obstruction in the ordinary vents, or from over-calculation; and the forced sales, at losing prices, may prostrate our establishments. From this view of the subject, it follows, that, if we would place the industry of our country upon a solid and unshakeable foundation, we must adopt the protecting policy, which has every where succeeded, and reject that which would abandon it, which has every where failed.

8. But if the policy of protection be wise, the gentleman from Virginia, (Mr. Barbour,) has made some ingenious calculations to prove that the measure of protection, already extended, has been sufficiently great. With some few exceptions, the existing duties, of which he has made an estimate, were laid with the object of revenue, and without reference to that of encouragement to our domestic industry; and, although it is admitted that the incidental effect of duties so laid is to promote

our manufactures, yet, if it falls short of competent protection, the duties might as well not have been imposed with reference to that purpose. A moderate addition may accomplish this desirable end; and the proposed tariff is believed to have this character.

9. The prohibitory policy, it is confidently asserted, is condemned by the wisdom of Europe, and by her most enlightened statesmen. Is this the fact? We call upon gentlemen to show in what instance a nation that has enjoyed its benefits has surrendered it. [Here Mr. Barbour rose, (Mr. Clay giving way,) and said that England had departed from it in the China trade, in allowing us to trade with her East India possessions, and in tolerating our navigation to her West India colonies.] With respect to the trade to China, the whole amount of what England has done is to modify the monopoly of the East India Company, in behalf of one and a small part of her subjects, to increase the commerce of another and the greater portion of them. The abolition of the restriction, therefore, operates altogether among the subjects of England; and does not touch at all the interests of foreign powers. The toleration of our commerce to British India, is for the sake of the specie, with which we mainly carry on that commerce, and which having performed its circuit, returns to Great Britain in exchange for British manufactures.

The relaxation from the colonial policy, in the instance of our trade and navigation with the West Indies, is a most unfortunate example for the honourable gentleman; for it is an illustrious proof of the success of our restrictive policy, when resolutely adhered to. Great Britain had prescribed the terms on which we were to be graciously allowed to carry on that trade. The effect of her regulations was to exclude our navigation altogether, and a complete monopoly, on the part of the British navigation, was secured. We forbade it, unless our vessels should be allowed a perfect reciprocity. Great Britain stood out a long time; but finally yielded, and our navigation now fairly shares with hers in the trade.

Have gentlemen no other to exhibit than these trivial relaxations from the prohibitory policy—which do not amount to a drop in the bucket—to prove its abandonment by Great Britain? Let them show us that her laws are repealed which prohibit the introduction of our flour and provisions; of French silks, laces, porcelain, manufactures of bronze, mirrors, woollens; and of the manufactures of all other nations; and then we may be ready to allow that Great Britain has really abolished her prohibitory policy. We find there, on the contrary, that system of policy in full and rigorous operation, and a most curiously interwoven system it is, as she enforces it. She begins by protecting all parts of her immense dominions against foreign nations. She then protects the parent country against the colonies; and finally, one part of the parent country against another. The sagacity of Scotch industry has carried the process of distillation to a perfection, which would place the art in England on a footing of disadvantageous competition, and English distillation has been protected accordingly. But

suppose it were even true that Great Britain had abolished all restrictions upon trade, and allowed the freest introduction of the produce of foreign labour, would that prove it unwise for us to adopt the protecting system? The object of protection is the establishment and perfection of the arts. In England it has accomplished its purpose, fulfilled its end. If she has not carried every branch of manufacture to the same high state of perfection that any other nation has, she has succeeded in so many, that she may safely challenge the most unshackled competition in exchanges. It is upon this very ground that many of her writers recommend an abandonment of the prohibitory system. It is to give greater scope to British industry and enterprize. It is upon the same selfish principle. The object of the most perfect freedom of trade, with such a nation as Britain, and of the most rigorous system of prohibition, with a nation whose arts are in their infancy, may both be precisely the same. In both cases, it is to give greater expansion to native industry. They only differ in the theatres of their operation. The abolition of the restrictive system by Britain, if by it she could prevail upon other nations to imitate her example, would have the effect of extending the consumption of British produce in other countries, where her writers boldly affirm it could maintain a fearless competition with the produce of native labour. The adoption of the restrictive system, on the part of the United States, by excluding the produce of foreign labour, would extend the consumption of American produce, unable in the infancy and unprotected state of the arts to sustain a competition with foreign fabrics. Let our arts breathe under the shade of protection; let them be perfected as they are in England, and we shall then be ready, as England now is said to be, to put aside protection, and to enter upon the freest exchanges. To what other cause, than to their whole prohibitory policy, can you ascribe British prosperity? It will not do to assign it to that of her antiquity; for France is no less ancient, though much less rich and powerful, in proportion to the population and natural advantages of France. Hallam, a sensible and highly approved writer on the middle ages, assigns the revival of the prosperity of the north of Europe to the success of the woollen manufactories of Flanders, and the commerce of which their fabrics became the subject; and the commencement of that of England to the establishment of similar manufactures there under the Edwards and to the prohibitions which began about the same time. As to the poor rates, the theme of so much reproach without England, and of so much regret within it, among her speculative writers, the system was a strong proof no less of her unbounded wealth than of her pauperism. What other nation can dispense, in form of regulated charity, the enormous sum, I believe, of 10 or 12 millions sterling? [Mr. Barbour stated it was reduced to six; to which Mr. Clay replied, that he entertained no doubt but that the benign operation of British protection of home industry had greatly reduced it, within the last few years, by the full employment of her subjects, of which her flourishing trade bore evidence.] The number of British paupers was the result of pressing the principle of population to its utmost limits, by her protecting policy, in the creation of wealth, and in placing the rest of the world under tribute to her industry. Doubtless the condition of England would be better, with-

out paupers, if in other respects it remained the same. But in her actual circumstances the poor system has the salutary effect of an equalizing corrective of the tendency to the concentration of riches, produced by the genius of her political institutions and by her prohibitory system.

But, is it true that England is convinced of the impolicy of the prohibitory system, and desirous to abandon it? What proof have we to that effect? We are asked to reject the evidence deducible from the settled and steady practice of England, and to take lessons in a school of philosophical writers, whose visionary theories are no where adopted; or, if adopted, bring with them inevitable distress, impoverishment, and ruin. Let us hear the testimony of an illustrious personage, entitled to the greatest attention, because he speaks after a full experiment of the unrestrictive system made in his own empire.

I hope I shall give no offence in quoting from a publication issued from "the mint of Philadelphia;" from a work of Mr. Carey, of whom I seize, with great pleasure, the occasion to say, that he merits the public gratitude, for the disinterested diligence with which he has collected a large mass of highly useful facts, and for the clear and convincing reasoning with which he generally illustrates them.

The Emperor of Russia, in March, 1822, after about two years' trial of the free system, says, through Count Nesselrode:

"To produce happy effects, the principles of commercial freedom must be generally adopted. *The state which adopts, whilst others reject them, must condemn its own industry and commerce, to pay a ruinous tribute to those of other nations.*"

"From a circulation exempt from restraint, and the facility afforded by reciprocal exchanges, almost all the governments at first resolved to seek the means of repairing the evil which Europe had been doomed to suffer; but *experience, and more correct calculations, because they were made from certain data, and upon the results already known of the peace that had just taken place, forced them soon to adhere to the prohibitory system.*"

"*England preserved hers. Austria remained faithful to the rule she had laid down, to guard herself against the rivalship of foreign industry. France, with the same views, adopted the most rigorous measures of precaution. And Prussia published a new tariff in October last, which proves that she found it impossible not to follow the example of the rest of Europe.*"

"In proportion as the prohibitory system is extended and rendered perfect in other countries, *that state which pursues the contrary system, makes, from day to day, sacrifices more extensive and more considerable. *** It offers a continual encouragement to the manufactures of other countries—and its own manufactures perish in the struggle which they are, as yet, unable to maintain.*

"It is with the most lively feelings of regret, we acknowledge, it is our own proper experience which enables us to trace this picture. *The*

evils which it details have been realized in Russia and Poland since the conclusion of the act of the 7-19 of December, 1818. AGRICULTURE WITHOUT A MARKET, INDUSTRY WITHOUT PROTECTION, LANGUISH AND DECLINE. SPECIE IS EXPORTED, AND THE MOST SOLID COMMERCIAL HOUSES ARE SHAKEN. The public prosperity would soon feel the wound inflicted on private fortunes, if new regulations did not promptly change the actual state of affairs.

“Events have proved that our AGRICULTURE and our COMMERCE, as well as our MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY, are not only paralyzed, but BROUGHT TO THE BRINK OF RUIN.”

The example of Spain has been properly referred to, as affording a striking proof of the calamities which attend a state that abandons the care of its own internal industry. Her prosperity was greatest, when the arts, brought there by the Moors, flourished most in that kingdom. Then she received from England her wool, and returned it in the manufactured state; and then England was least prosperous. The two nations have reversed conditions. Spain, after the discovery of America, yielding to an inordinate passion for the gold of the Indies, sought in their mines that wealth which might have been better created at home. Can the remarkable difference in the state of the prosperity of the two countries, be otherwise explained, than by the opposite systems which they pursued? England, by a sedulous attention to her home industry, supplied the means of an advantageous commerce with her colonies. Spain, by an utter neglect of her domestic resources, confided altogether in those which she derived from her colonies, and presents an instance of the greatest adversity. Her colonies were infinitely more valuable than those of England; and if she had adopted a similar policy, is it unreasonable to suppose that, in wealth and power, she would have surpassed that of England? I think the honourable gentleman from Virginia does great injustice to the Catholic religion, in specifying that as one of the leading causes of the decline of Spain. It is a religion entitled to great respect; and there is nothing in its character incompatible with the highest degree of national prosperity. Is not France, the most polished, in many other respects the most distinguished state of Christendom, Catholic? Is not Flanders, the most populous part of Europe, also Catholic? Are the Catholic parts of Switzerland and of Germany less prosperous than those which are Protestant?

10. The next objection of the honourable gentleman from Virginia, which I shall briefly notice is, that the manufacturing system is adverse to the genius of our government, in its tendency to the accumulation of large capitals in a few hands; in the corruption of the public morals, which is alleged to be incident to it; and in the consequent danger to the public liberty. The first part of the objection would apply to every lucrative business, to commerce, to planting, and to the learned professions. Would the gentleman introduce the system of Lycurgus? If his principle be correct, it should be extended to any and every vocation which had a similar tendency. The enormous fortunes in our country—the nabobs of the land—have been chiefly made by the profitable pursuit of that foreign commerce, in more propitious times, which the honourable gentleman would so carefully cherish. Immense

estates have also been made in the South. The dependents are, perhaps, not more numerous upon that wealth which is accumulated in manufactures, than they are upon that which is acquired by commerce and by agriculture. We may safely confide in the laws of distributions, and in the absence of the rule of primogeniture, for the dissipation, perhaps too rapid, of large fortunes. What has become of those which were held two or three generations back in Virginia? Many of the descendants of the ancient aristocracy, as it was called, of that state, are now in the most indigent condition.

The best security against the demoralization of society, is the constant and profitable employment of its members. The greatest danger to public liberty is from idleness and vice. If manufactures form cities, so does commerce. And the disorders and violence which proceed from the contagion of the passions, are as frequent in one description of those communities as in the other. There is no doubt but that the yeomanry of a country is the safest depository of public liberty. In all time to come, and under any probable direction of the labour of our population, the agricultural class must be much the most numerous and powerful, and will ever retain, as it ought to retain, a preponderating influence in our councils. The extent and the fertility of our lands constitute an adequate security against an excess in manufactures, and also against oppression on the part of capitalists towards the labouring portions of the community.

11. The last objection, with a notice of which I shall trouble the Committee, is, that the Constitution does not authorize the passage of the bill. The gentleman from Virginia does not assert, indeed, that it is inconsistent with the express provisions of that instrument, but he thinks it incompatible with the spirit of the Constitution. If we attempt to provide for the internal improvement of the country, the Constitution, according to some gentlemen, stands in our way. If we attempt to protect American industry against foreign policy and the rivalry of foreign industry, the Constitution presents an insuperable obstacle. This Constitution must be a most singular instrument! It seems to be made for any other people than our own. Its action is altogether foreign. Congress has power to lay duties and imports, under no other limitation whatever than that of their being uniform throughout the United States. But they can only be imposed, according to the honourable gentleman, for the sole purpose of revenue. This is a restriction which we do not find in the Constitution. No doubt revenue was a principal object with the framers of the Constitution in investing Congress with the power. But, in executing it, may not the duties and imposts be so laid as to secure domestic interest! Or is Congress denied all discretion as to the amount or the distribution of the duties and imposts?

The gentleman from Virginia has, however, entirely mistaken the clause of the Constitution on which we rely. It is that which gives to Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. The grant is plenary, without any limitation whatever, and

includes the whole power of regulation, of which the subject to be regulated is susceptible. It is as full and complete a grant of the power, as that is to declare war. What is a regulation of commerce? It implies the admission or exclusion of the objects of it, and the terms. Under this power some articles, by the existing laws, are admitted freely, others are subjected to duties so high as to amount to their prohibition, and various rates of duties are applied to others. Under this power, laws of total non-intercourse with some nations, and embargoes, producing an entire cessation of commerce with all foreign countries, have been, from time to time, passed. These laws, I have no doubt, met with the entire approbation of the gentleman from Virginia. [Mr. Barbour said that he was not in Congress.] Wherever the gentleman was, whether on his farm or in the pursuit of that profession of which he is an ornament, I have no doubt that he gave his zealous support to the laws referred to.

The principle of the system under consideration, has the sanction of some of the best and wisest men, in all ages, in foreign countries as well as in our own—of the Edwards, of Henry the Great, of Elizabeth, of the Colberts, abroad; of our Franklin, Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton, at home. But it comes recommended to us by a higher authority than any of these, illustrious as they unquestionably are—by the master spirit of the age—that extraordinary man, who has thrown the Alexanders and the Cæsars infinitely farther behind him than they stood in advance of the most eminent of their predecessors—that singular man, who, whether he was seated on his imperial throne, deciding the fate of nations and allotting kingdoms to the members of his family, with the same composure, if not with the same affection, as that with which a Virginia father divides his plantations among his children, or on the miserable rock of St. Helena, to which he was condemned by the cruelty and the injustice of his unworthy victors, is equally an object of the most intense admiration. He appears to have comprehended, with the rapidity of intuition, the true interests of a state, and to have been able, by the turn of a single expression, to develope the secret springs of the policy of cabinets. We find that Las Cases reports him to have said :

“He opposed the principles of economists, which he said were correct in theory though erroneous in their application. The political constitution of different states, continued he, must render these principles defective; local circumstances continually call for deviations from their uniformity. Duties, he said, which were so severely condemned by political economists, should not, it is true, be an object to the treasury: they should be the guarantee and protection of a nation, and should correspond with the nature and the objects of its trade. Holland, which is destitute of productions and manufactures, and which was a trade only of transit and commission, should be free of all fetters and barriers. France, on the contrary, which is rich in every sort of production and manufactures, should incessantly guard against the importations of a rival, who might still continue superior to her, and also against the cupidity, egotism, and indifference of mere brokers.

"I have not fallen into the error of modern systematizers," said the Emperor, "who imagine that all the wisdom of nations is centered in themselves. Experience is the true wisdom of nations. And what does all the reasoning of economists amount to? They incessantly extol the prosperity of England, and hold her up as our model; but the Custom-House system is more burthensome and arbitrary in England than in any other country. They also condemn prohibitions; yet it was England set the example of prohibitions; and they are in fact necessary with regard to certain objects. Duties cannot adequately supply the place of prohibitions: there will always be found means to defeat the object of the legislator. In France we are still very far behind on these delicate points, which are still unperceived or ill-understood by the mass of society. Yet, what advancement have we not made,—what correctness of ideas has been introduced by my gradual classification of agriculture, industry, and trade; objects so distinct in themselves, and which present so great and positive a graduation!"

"1st.—*Agriculture*; the soul, the first basis of the empire.

"2d.—*Industry*; the comfort and happiness of the population.

"3d.—*Foreign Trade*; the superabundance, the proper application of the surplus of agriculture and industry.

"Agriculture was continually improving during the whole course of the revolution. Foreigners thought it ruined in France. In 1814, however, the English were compelled to admit that we had little or nothing to learn from them.

"Industry or manufactures, and internal trade, made immense progress during my reign. The application of chemistry to the manufactures caused them to advance with giant strides. I gave an impulse, the effects of which extended throughout Europe.

"Foreign trade, which in its results is infinitely inferior to agriculture, was an object of subordinate importance in my mind. Foreign trade is made for agriculture and home industry, and not the two latter for the former. The interests of these three fundamental cases are diverging and frequently conflicting. I always promoted them in their natural gradation; but I could not and ought not to have ranked them all on an equality. Time will unfold what I have done, the national resources which I created, and the emancipation from the English which I brought about. We have now the secret of the commercial treaty of 1783. France still exclaims against its author; but the English demanded it on pain of resuming the war. They wished to do the same after the treaty of Amiens; but I was then all-powerful; I was a hundred cubits high. I replied that if they were in possession of the heights of Montmartre I would still refuse to sign the treaty. These words were echoed through Europe.

"The English will now impose some such treaty on France, at least if popular clamour, and the opposition of the mass of the nation, do not force them to draw back. This thralldom would be an additional disgrace in the eyes of that nation, which is now beginning to acquire a just perception of her own interests.

"When I came to the head of the government, the American ships, which were permitted to enter our ports on the score of their neutrality, brought us raw materials, and had the impudence to sail from

France without freight, for the purpose of taking in cargoes of English goods in London. They moreover had the insolence to make their payments, when they had any to make, by giving bills on persons in London. Hence the vast profits reaped by the English manufacturers and brokers, entirely to our prejudice. I made a law that no American should import goods to any amount, without immediately exporting their exact equivalent. A loud outcry was raised against this: it was said that I had ruined trade. But what was the consequence? Notwithstanding the closing of my ports, and in spite of the English, who ruled the seas, the Americans returned and submitted to my regulations. What might I not have done under more favourable circumstances?

“Thus I naturalized in France the manufacture of cotton, which includes:—

“1st. *Spun-cotton*.—We did not previously spin it ourselves; the English supplied us with it as a sort of favour.

“2d. *The web*.—We did not yet make it; it came to us from abroad.

“3d. *The printing*.—This was the only part of the manufacture that we performed ourselves. I wished to naturalize the two first branches; and I proposed to the Council of State, that their importation should be prohibited. This excited great alarm. I sent for Oberkamp, and I conversed with him a long time. I learned from him, that this prohibition would doubtless produce a shock, but that after a year or two of perseverance, it would prove a triumph, whence we should derive immense advantages. Then I issued my decree in spite of all; this was a true piece of statesmanship.

“I at first confined myself merely to prohibiting the web; then I extended the prohibition to spun cotton; and we now possess within ourselves the three branches of the cotton manufacture, to the great benefit of our population, and the injury and regret of the English:—which proves that in civil government, as well as in war, decision of character is often indispensable to success.”

I will trouble the Committee with only one other quotation, which I shall make from Lowe, and from hearing which the Committee must share with me in the mortification which I felt on perusing it. That author says: “It is now above 40 years since the United States of America were definitively separated from us, and since their situation has afforded a proof that the benefit of mercantile intercourse may be retained, in all its extent, without the care of governing, or the expense of defending, these once regretted provinces.” Is there not too much truth in this observation? By adhering to the foreign policy, which I have been discussing, do we not remain essentially British, in every thing but the form of our government? Are not our interests, our industry, our commerce, so modified as to swell British pride, and to increase British power?

Mr. Chairman, our confederacy comprehends, within its vast limits, great diversity of interests—agricultural—planting—farming—commercial—navigating—fishing—manufacturing. No one of these interests is felt in the same degree, and cherished with the

same solicitude, throughout all parts of the Union. Some of them are peculiar to particular sections of our common country. But all these great interests are confided to the protection of one government—to the fate of one ship; and a most gallant ship it is, with a noble crew. If we prosper, and are happy, protection must be extended to all; it is due to all. It is the great principle on which obedience is demanded from all.

If our essential interests cannot find protection from our own government against the policy of foreign powers, where are they to get it? We did not unite for sacrifice, but for preservation. The inquiry should be, in reference to the great interests of every section of the Union, (I speak not of minute subdivisions,) what would be done for those interests if that section stood alone and separated from the residue of the Republic? If the promotion of those interests would not injuriously affect any other section, then every thing should be done for them, which would be done if it formed a distinct government. If they come into absolute collision with the interests of another section, a reconciliation, if possible, should be attempted, by mutual concession, so as to avoid a sacrifice of the prosperity of either to that of the other. In such a case all should not be done for one which would be done if it were separated and independent, but something; and, in devising the measure, the good of each part and of the whole should be carefully consulted. This is the only mode by which we can preserve, in full vigour, the harmony of the whole Union. The South entertains one opinion, and imagines that a modification of the existing policy of the country, for the protection of American industry, involves the ruin of the South. The North, the East, the West, hold the opposite opinion, and feel and contemplate, in a longer adherence to the foreign policy, as it now exists, their utter destruction.

Is it true, that the interests of these great sections of our country are irreconcilable with each other? Are we reduced to the sad and afflicting dilemma of determining which shall fall a victim to the prosperity of the other? Happily, I think, there is no such distressing alternative. If the North, the West, and the East, formed an independent state, unassociated with the South, can there be a doubt that the restrictive system would be carried to the point of prohibition of every foreign fabric of which they produce the raw material, and which they could manufacture? Such would be their policy, if they stood alone; but they are fortunately connected with the South, which believes its interest to require a free admission of foreign manufactures. Here then is a case for mutual concession, for fair compromise. The bill under consideration presents this compromise. It is a medium between the absolute exclusion and the unrestricted admission of the produce of foreign industry. It sacrifices the interest of neither section to that of the other; neither, it is true, gets all that it wants, nor is subject to all that it fears. But it has been said, that the South obtains nothing in this compromise. Does it lose any thing? is the first question. I have endeavoured

to prove that it does not, by showing that a mere transfer is effected in the source of the supply of its consumption from Europe to America; and that the loss, whatever it may be, of the sale of its great staple in Europe, is compensated by the new market created in America. But does the South really gain nothing in this compromise? The consumption of the other sections, though somewhat restricted, is still left open by this bill, to foreign fabrics purchased by Southern staples. So far, its operation is beneficial to the South, and prejudicial to the industry of the other sections, and that is the point of mutual concession.

The South will also gain by the extended consumption of its great staple, produced by an increased capacity to consume it in consequence of the establishment of the home market. But the South cannot exert its industry and enterprise in the business of manufactures! Why not? The difficulties, if not exaggerated, are artificial, and may therefore be surmounted. But can the other sections embark in the planting occupations of the South? The obstructions which forbid them are natural, created by the immutable laws of God, and therefore, unconquerable.

Other, and animating considerations, invite us to adopt the policy of this system. Its importance, in connexion with the general defence in time of war, cannot fail to be duly estimated. Need I recall to our painful recollection the sufferings, for the want of an adequate supply of absolute necessities, to which the defenders of their country's rights and our entire population were subjected during the late war? Or to remind the Committee of the great advantage of a steady and unfailing source of supply, unaffected alike in war and in peace? Its importance, in reference to the stability of our Union, that paramount and greatest of all our interests, cannot fail warmly to recommend it, or at least to conciliate the forbearance of every patriot bosom. Now our people present the spectacle of a vast assemblage of jealous rivals, all eagerly rushing to the sea board, jostling each other in their way, to hurry off to glutted foreign markets the perishable produce of their labour. The tendency of that policy, in conformity to which this bill is prepared, is to transform these competitors into friends and mutual customers; and, by the reciprocal exchanges of their respective productions, to place the confederacy upon the most solid of all foundations—the basis of common interest.

And is not government called upon, by every stimulating motive, to adapt its policy to the actual condition and extended growth of our great republic? At the commencement of our Constitution, almost the whole population of the United States was confined between the Alleghany mountains and the Atlantic ocean. Since that epoch, the western part of New-York, of Pennsylvania, of Virginia, all the western states and territories, have been principally peopled. Prior to that period we had scarcely any interior. An interior has sprung up as it were by enchantment, and along with it new interests and new relations, requiring the parental protection of govern-

ment. Our policy should be modified accordingly, so as to comprehend all, and sacrifice none.

And are we not encouraged by the success of past experience, in respect to the only article which has been adequately protected? Already have the predictions of the friends of the American system, in even a shorter time than their most sanguine hopes could have anticipated, been completely realized in regard to that article; and consumption is now better and cheaper supplied with coarse cottons, than it was under the prevalence of the foreign system.

Even if the benefits of the policy were limited to certain sections of our country, would it not be satisfactory to behold American industry, wherever situated, active, animated, and thrifty, rather than persevere in a course which renders us subservient to foreign industry? But these benefits are twofold, direct and collateral, and in the one shape or the other they will diffuse themselves throughout the Union. All parts of the Union will participate, more or less, in both. As to the direct benefit, it is probable that the North and the East will enjoy the largest share. But the West and the South will also participate in them. Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Richmond, will divide with the Northern capitals the business of manufacturing. The latter city unites more advantages for its successful prosecution than any other place I know; Zanesville, in Ohio, only excepted. And where the direct benefit does not accrue, that will be enjoyed of supplying the raw material and provisions for the consumption of artisans. Is it not most desirable to put at rest and prevent the annual recurrence of this unpleasant subject, so well fitted by the various interests to which it appeals, to excite irritation and to produce discontent? Can that be effected by its rejection?

Behold the mass of petitions which lie on our table, earnestly and anxiously entreating the protecting interposition of Congress against the ruinous policy which we are pursuing. Will these petitioners, comprehending all orders of society, entire states and communities, public companies and private individuals, spontaneously assembling, cease in their humble prayers by your lending a deaf ear? Can you expect that these petitioners, and others, in countless numbers, that will, if you delay the passage of this bill, supplicate your mercy, should contemplate their substance gradually withdrawn to foreign countries, their ruin slow, but certain and as inevitable as death itself, without one expiring effort? You think the measure injurious to you; we believe our preservation depends upon its adoption. Our convictions, mutually honest, are equally strong. What is to be done? I invoke that saving spirit of mutual concession under which our blessed Constitution was formed, and under which alone it can be happily administered. I appeal to the South—to the high-minded, generous, and patriotic South—with which I have so often co-operated, in attempting to sustain the honour and to vindicate the rights of our country. Should it not offer, upon the altar of the public good, some sacrifice of its peculiar

opinions? Of what does it complain? A possible temporary enhancement in the objects of consumption. Of what do we complain? A total incapacity, produced by the foreign policy, to purchase, at any price, necessary foreign objects of consumption. In such an alternative, inconvenient only to it, ruinous to us, can we expect too much from Southern magnanimity?

The just and confident expectation of the passage of this bill has flooded the country with recent importations of foreign fabrics. If it should not pass, they will complete the work of destruction of our domestic industry. If it should pass, they will prevent any considerable rise in the price of foreign commodities, until our own industry shall be able to supply competent substitutes.

To the friends of the tariff, I would also anxiously appeal. Every arrangement of its provisions does not suit each of you; you desire some further alterations; you would make it perfect. You want what you will never get. Nothing human is perfect. And I have seen, with great surprise, a piece signed by a member of Congress, published in the National Intelligencer, stating that this bill must be rejected, and a judicious tariff brought in as its substitute. A *judicious* tariff! No member of Congress could have signed that piece; or, if he did, the public ought not to be deceived. If this bill do not pass, unquestionably no other can pass at this session, or probably during this Congress. And who will go home and say that he rejected all the benefits of this bill because molasses has been subjected to the enormous additional duty of five cents per gallon? I call, therefore, upon the friends of the American policy, to yield somewhat of their own peculiar wishes, and not to reject the practicable in the idle pursuit after the unattainable. Let us imitate the illustrious example of the framers of the Constitution, and, always remembering that whatever springs from man partakes of his imperfections, depend upon experience to suggest, in future, the necessary amendments.

We have had great difficulties to encounter. 1. The splendid talents which are arrayed in this House against us. 2. We are opposed by the rich and powerful in the land. 3. The Executive government, if any, affords us but a cold and equivocal support. 4. The importing and navigating interests, I verily believe from misconception, are adverse to us. 5. The British factors and the British influence are inimical to our success. 6. Long established habits and prejudices oppose us. 7. The reviewers and literary speculators, foreign and domestic. And, lastly, the leading presses of the country, including the influence of that which is established in this city, and sustained by the public purse.

From some of these, or other causes, the bill may be postponed, thwarted, defeated. But the cause is the cause of the country, and it must and will prevail. It is founded in the interests and affections of the people. It is as native as the granite deeply imbosomed in our mountains. And, in conclusion, I would pray God, in His infinite mercy, to avert from our country the evils which are impending over it, and, by enlightening our councils, to conduct us into that path which leads to riches, to greatness, to glory.

VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE.

MR. GILES'S SPEECH,

DELIVERED IN THE

HOUSE OF DELEGATES, FEBRUARY 21, 1827.

Substance of the remarks made by Mr. GILES, upon the report of the Committee of Enquiry—corrected, and improved from the newspaper version.—Gen. TAYLOR having, from the commencement of the discussion of this subject, sounded the tocsin of alarm, in the most frightful terms, his rich imagination could invent, Mr. G. introduced his remarks in allusion to that topic:

MR. SPEAKER.—Permit me to congratulate you, sir, and this honorable house, upon the discovery, that the tocsin, should have been, so recently, sounded in vain within these walls. That war's portentous alarms, have already passed away; and that we find ourselves, still in peace, and tranquillity, commencing the consideration of the report of the committee of enquiry, upon the all important subject, *of the relative rights of the general and state governments.* I propose, to avail myself of this state of security, whilst engaged in expressing my opinions, respecting these relative rights, fully to discharge the responsible duty imposed upon myself, in calling for this enquiry; undeterred, by threats, and war's alarms from any quarter. Nor could I condescend, to yield to these extraneous influences, were I now engaged in *devising operative constitutional means, for securing the rights of this state, against the usurpations of the general government.* This is not my present duty; were it so, I should enter into it, with pleasure, and alacrity. My present duty, I conceive, consists, in a full, and free disclosure of the principal considerations, which have urged me, most earnestly to call the attention of this house, to this deeply interesting subject.—In the first place; I conceive, the objects involved in the enquiry, are of the very first impression. I conceive; they involve the questions, whether the general government is hereafter to be administered, upon the great principle of human rights, as developed, and proclaimed by our fore-fathers, in our written constitutions, or upon the old, despotic doctrines of European monarchies? Whether an undefined, unlimited, consolidated government, is to be substituted for a limited, federative, one? and whether, the whole mass of the productions of the labor of society, belongs to the government in its corporate character, to be distributed, at its pleasure; or whether each portion thereof, belongs to the individual laborer, who produced it, to be disposed of at his pleasure? Or, in other words: Whether private property, is a natural right, or a governmental donation? Surely these questions, or either of them, will be admitted by all, to be of sufficient magnitude, to attract the whole attention of this house, and to put into requisition, the whole

energies of its best mental powers.—And, sir, whilst I now solemnly invoke the whole talents of the house, upon this deeply interesting occasion, it affords me perfect consolation to believe, if brought to act, in a pure philosophical spirit of enquiry after truth, they will be found amply competent to a perfect developement of all the great fundamental principles, now sought to be investigated. It was from this firm conviction, that I expressed the wish upon the first introduction of this subject, that the enquiry should be the enquiry of the whole house, and of each individual member of it. That each individual member should make the case his own. Least of all, did I wish it, to be considered as exclusively my own; and, Mr. Speaker, can I wish in vain for this most desirable course of investigation? Have we not all an equal, and common interest in the objects of it? Then, why should not each of us exert the best efforts of his own mind, in contributing his due share of reflections, to conduct us to just, and true results? Let us then, sir, nobly banish all first impressions: Let us forget all party politics; all personal, and local prejudices, and with reciprocal confidence, like a band of brothers, united in interests, united in objects, united in affections, march directly on, in one solid phalanx, to the ascertainment of the truth. An enquiry, conducted, under the potent influence of this benign, and liberal spirit, upon subjects involving the deepest interests of ourselves, of the whole American people, of our posterity, and of the whole human race, could not fail of the happiest, and most complete success. I pledge myself, sir, so far as I may be engaged in the discussion, to be influenced, solely, by a calm, and philosophical enquiry after truth; and I shall not disguise the fact; that I have brought the best efforts of my mind, to bear their whole force upon this investigation.—Indeed, upon a subject, so momentous, I should deem myself wanting, in due respect to this house, and in justice to myself, were I to hazard any inconsiderate views of it; or in fact, any thing short of the best developments of my mind; resuling from the most mature, and profound reflections and deliberations.—Yes! Mr. Speaker, I candidly confess, that if I should be mistaken in the views of the subject, I shall now proceed to present to the house, the mistake will have arisen from the want of capacity to comprehend the just, and right views of it; and not from the want, of the most attentive examination, reflection; and deliberation.

But, before I enter upon this discussion, I beg leave to premise; that I shall confine my remarks, principally, to the subject of the tariff; because that branch of the investigation, is peculiarly urgent. Whilst, I conceive, it founded in the grossest violation of morals, of principles and of policy, it is daily, and hourly, operating to our impoverishment; whereas the power claimed to make internal improvements upon the grand original scale, is certainly for the present, impeded in its operations; and time for reflection to a deluded people, must consequently be afforded. The power to make internal improvements, can never be exercised, as a *complete*, still less, as an *exclusive* power, by the general government—because, its exercise, necessarily involves complete unqualified jurisdiction over territory. This is consolidation in its essence—I verily believe, there is not one state in the Union, which would surrender this power to the general government, if that distinct question, were brought directly to its consideration. I therefore, conceive,

the attempt at this usurpation, has nearly reached its ultimatum. Its impracticability appears to be already developed. Besides, the profligate expenditures of the general government, and the crippled condition of the revenue, arising from the excesses to which a blind, unprincipled avarice, has driven up the tariff, have, *at least for the present, deprived* the general government of the means of making extensive appropriations, for internal improvements. I shall, therefore, let this branch of the subject rest for the present; and devote my undivided attention, to the examination of the tariff. To its doctrines,—*principles*, it has *none*. To its policy—this branch of the subject, imperiously calls for more animadversions, than could be comprehended, within the limits of a single speech. I shall first premise, however, that the claims of the powers to make internal improvements, and to protect manufactures, are twin usurpations. They were begotten together; and the one, was made dependent on the other—a high tariff was found indispensably necessary in the first instance, to raise ample funds for splendid, internal improvements—and the waste of the public treasure, in expenditures for schemes for internal improvements afforded a pretext for laying the enormous tariff; and will be used for keeping it up, when all legitimate objects for this excessive, and unprincipled tax upon the people shall cease. But the avarice of the favored manufacturing class, blind and insatiable, has already driven up the tariff, in many respects, to a prohibitory standard. Importations have consequently become lessened, and the revenue crippled. Internal improvements, upon the original, grand, glittering, fascinating plan, must, in consequence of this unexpected miscalculation and mishap, stand still for the present. All the visionary delusions resulting from the enchanting promises to beautify the whole country, must now have patience; and look with deep anxiety to the fatal destinies awaiting the tariff—not only its unexpected practical effects in crippling the revenue; but its still more destructive, and unexpected political effects, in dissolving the union of these states. Yes, sir, disguise it as you may—conceal it if you can—the essence of the tariff, is disunion—disunion in sectional interests—in individual occupations—A war of all the discordant elements, of the different occupations in society, urged on, by individual cupidity, and grounded upon incessant efforts of reciprocal plunder—cunning, being substituted for principle. You need not look, sir, for this disunion, in any collateral causes whatever. It must inevitably result from the inherent, intrinsic viciousness of the measure itself—It is founded in immorality; it violates the sacred right of private property. There is no cure for vices like these. Before entering into an examination of the true character of the tariff in detail, I beg leave to present to the House, a brief view of its origin, and progress, until its arrival at its present bold, and unqualified avowal of direct usurpation. The notion of discriminating duties, seems to have been coeval with the first attempt to carry into effect the specified power to lay and collect “imposts.” But it was then professed to be bottomed exclusively upon the power to raise revenue; the proceeds of which, were to be applied to the effectuation of the objects, specifically enumerated in the constitution; and it was limited *in practice*, to a few articles of the first necessity. At that day, it had never, as I believe, entered into the imagination of any man,

that Congress possessed the power of protecting manufactures, as an original, distinct, substantive power. The policy of discriminating duties, as a means of raising revenue, was subsequently extended to other articles of domestic manufactures, without sufficiently exciting the attention of the other occupations of society, who furnished this protection, until the watchful cupidity of the whole manufacturing class, not only urged its extension to a protection, of every domestic manufactured article, but increased that protection on many, to a shameful, and intolerable amount. This was not done, however, until the public mind had been prepared for it, by periodical and other publications, circulated with incessant vigilance, and perseverance; and in 1824, for the first time, according to my recollection, the unprincipled, and daring pretensions was set up, to an unqualified power to protect manufactures, without regard to raising revenue. And when one of its contemplated effects would be, to lessen the revenue. This was the express avowal of the chairman of the committee who reported the bill, at the time of its introduction, in the early part of the session of Congress. But before the final passage of the bill, this language was changed; and it was then declared, to be a bill for raising revenue; although no revenue had been called for by the treasury department, nor was it even pretended that any revenue was wanted. Here too, is seen, *an unexampled singularity* in the adoption of this most extraordinary measure, to get at a favorite object, utterly regardless of principle or precedent. The representatives of the people imposing a tax upon their constituents, estimated, variously by individual members, at from three to seven millions of dollars—without a demand from the treasury department—without the semblance of an official estimate—and without any revenue object whatever; but for an object, which has inverted the great principle, adopted for the preservation of American liberty—that property is the gift of God; and not the gift of government; and thus, bringing about a complete revolution in the fundamental laws of the United States.

In searching for the doctrines, in *an embodied, tangible form*, which had been brought forth to justify this most unwise, unjust, unequal, and impolitic measure, I have been referred, by its friends, to Mr. Clay's speech upon the tariff bill of 1824, in the House of Representatives. This speech is relied upon by the tariff schemers, as containing its whole doctrine, both constitutional, and politic. I have always considered this, as one of Mr. Clay's *principal prize* speeches, for the Presidency; and expected to find its characteristics corresponding with the sublime prize at stake—a dazzling, fascinating prize! and surely to be won, by the successful destinies of a splendid, glittering speech!! It accordingly appears; that Mr. C's mind had become wrought up to such a state of indescribable excitement upon the dazzling occasion, that he had put his whole energies into requisition for the grand purpose of realizing the enchanting, delusive hope. So much were Mr. Clay's mental anxieties, and efforts, excited upon the dazzling occasion; that Mr. Clay most humbly prostrated himself before the throne of divine grace, with the most anxious, and fervent orisons, to the "Most High;" that He would graciously be pleased, to purify, and sublimate Mr. Clay, with the aid of divine inspiration, to enable him to succeed in the grand,

enchanting enterprize, he had in view. For, says Mr. Clay, in his devotional, sublimated, bombastic exordium; in the first page: "But that responsibility inspires me with no other apprehension than that I shall be unable to fulfil my duty; with no other solicitude, than that I may, at least, in some small degree, contribute to recall my country from the pursuit of a fatal policy, which appears to me inevitably to lead to its impoverishment and ruin. I do feel most awfully this responsibility. And, if it were allowable for us, at the present day, to imitate ancient examples, I would invoke the aid of the Most High. I would anxiously and fervently implore His Divine assistance; that He would be graciously pleased to shower on my country His richest blessings; and that He would sustain, on this interesting occasion, the humble individual who stands before Him, and lend him the power, moral and physical, to perform the solemn duties which now belong to his public station."

The speech abounds with inflated, bombastic, visionary notions, deceptive miscalculations, and statistics, requiring great labor, and research for their collection.—They seem to be peculiarly suited to the sublimated state of Mr. Clay's mind. They consist of sonorous millions, and hundreds of millions of persons, and things; drawn from the political beaureaus of all the governments of Europe, as well as of our own. Any thing less than millions, and hundreds of millions, would have been but little suited to the enchanting occasion—whilst Mr. Clay's mind was borne aloft, by fond delusive hopes, and confident anticipations. In regard to this portion of the speech, however, I have always understood, and believe; that Mr. Clay is mainly indebted to his political friend and pioneer, Mr. Mathew Carey. Mr. Clay's reliance for success in all his own political notions, and trafficking schemes, is upon the native brilliancy of his own genius, which seems always to act, as if by instinct, upon the first blush of every subject, and which would disdain all the drudgery of plodding after statistics—all dull researches, and deep meditations. No! Mr. Clay delights not in these exercises of the mind—Mr. C. delights in the brilliant, and superficial; not in the deep, and contemplative. If he should not find truth floating on the surface, he finds her, not at all; and unfortunately for him, he seems to have given himself up too much to Mr. Carey for the drudgery of this part of his speech. This vast collection of facts, if true, might have been of service in other hands; but to Mr. Carey, they were worse than nothing, for, it appears to me, he entirely misunderstood their bearings, and applications; and has led Mr. Clay, into some of the most material of his own errors. I will not undertake to pronounce positively; that Mr. Clay did not understand the whole of his own speech—but I do pronounce, either that Mr. Clay has misunderstood, or misconceived the just inferences from Mr. Carey's statistics; or, that I am utterly incapable of comprehending Mr. C's speech; or, of making the just inferences from them myself. Mr. Clay, seemed so sensible of the obligation he had placed himself under to Mr. Carey for this portion of his speech, that he introduces him in page 37, in the following words: "I hope I shall give no offence in quoting *from* a publication '*from* the Mint of Philadelphia,' *from* a work of Mr. Carey's, of whom I seize with great pleasure on this occasion to say, that he merits the public gra-

titude, for the disinterested diligence with which he has collected a large mass of highly useful facts, and for the clear, and convincing reasoning, with which he generally illustrates them." This would seem to be an admission by Mr. Clay, of his obligation to Mr. Carey, both for facts, and reasonings. But I differ entirely with Mr. Clay, as to Mr. Carey's reasonings about this large mass of highly useful facts; and as to the large mass of highly useful facts themselves; whilst, I pretend not to know; whether they be true, or false in themselves, I do know, that the portion of them, quoted in Mr. Clay's speech, is arranged in such form, as to produce the most delusive results; and that in some of their most important bearings, Mr. Clay does not himself understand the just results, clearly deducible from them.

Mr. Carey seems to have become so entirely bewildered, with the incomprehensibility of his vast, and complicated subject, as to have sacrificed at its shrine, unconsciously, I am sure, his own love of liberty, the liberty of his country, and of the hope of future liberty, to the whole human race; and to have become enamoured, with the most despotic, antiquated, and almost obsolete doctrines of the most despotic governments of Europe. His bewildered delusions, he has ushered forth to the world, in a style, and spirit, which, in my humble judgment, and with all due charity, would do no honor to the literary taste of any people, who would give them the sanction of their approbation; and would, do no credit to the political intelligence of any nation in Europe. I verily believe, that the profligate Ferdinand, and his bigotted priests, *theoretically unlimited in will*, would reluctantly extend, *their administrative policy in practice*, so as to include the whole scope of the despotic doctrines, which have been ushered forth by Mr. Carey, and his tribe of political economists, and, most alarmingly, adopted by the administration. These doctrines, I understand, to be the actual foundation of the administrative policy of the general government.— Thus converting the federative principle, into a consolidated one; and silently effecting a complete civil revolution in the fundamental laws. It shall be my first attempt to prove, that the present administrative policy of the general government, is bottomed upon the doctrines of Mr. Carey, and his tribe of writers, and my second will be, to prove, that these doctrines assert and sanction the despotism of governments, in *their* most unlimited range. Mr. Carey had been most actively employed for many years, in issuing forth his political nostrums, for increasing the wealth, and prosperity of the United States, by the cunning device, of protecting manufactures, and finally, attracted more attention, than could have been expected from the preposterous notions, contained in these political nostrums. An interested class, observing this strange success of Mr. Carey's writings, urged him on, by all the stimulants within their power. But also observing, that Mr. Carey's vast collection of statistics, had rather overshadowed, and obscured his mental powers, determined to call into his assistance, some farther literary aid. Mr. Daniel Raymond, of Baltimore, therefore, entered the lists, whether with, or without reward, I know not, in favor of Mr. Carey's bewildered doctrines, and has endeavored to give them a body and a form. Accordingly, in 1820, Mr. Raymond issued forth his book, under the title of "Raymond's Elements of Political Economy." The first edi-

tion having met with a rapid unexpected sale, another edition was issued in 1823. In this edition may be seen the doctrines upon which the tariff bill of 1824 is founded, and doctrines which since have been ayowed by members of Congress in their places; particularly by Mr. Clay in his glittering tariff speech, by the President in his message to Congress, and by his Secretary, (Mr. Rush,) in his official, responsible report. I hope the house will indulge me with their patience, whilst upon this point. I deem the enquiry all important, and shall often have reference to it in the course of my remarks.—I should be perfectly willing, even to encroach upon the patience of the house, could I be so fortunate, as to call, and rivet its attention to this point. Important as it is, its true characteristics have not yet attracted the public attention; or it would not be possible to conceive, that the people of the United States could sleep so profoundly, under doctrines calculated to strip them, of the last vestige of their liberties. I propose to make full quotations; that the comparison of these doctrines of the political economists, and the present administration, should not be mistaken by one intelligent human being, who will take the trouble of making a strict examination, and comparison of them.

Mr. Raymond having labored in his 1st vol. to prove, "That government, is an unity"—"one and indivisible," which hypothesis, in all his doctrines upon that point, is applied to the general government, proceeds to shew, by what laws, legislators are bound to govern the people, over whom, they preside; and the description of persons, who constitute our legislators; and expresses himself in the following words:

Extract—1st vol. page 222.

"Legislators, however, are not permitted to take such limited short-sighted views of things—they are placed on a more elevated station; they move in a higher sphere; they are traitors to their high trust, if they do not look to the future as well as the present—they are in one sense, (though, in a very humble one) the vicegerents of God on earth, and as he regulates and governs the world, "by the laws of eternal justice and wisdom." In regard to the future, as well as the present, *by the same law, ought legislators to regulate, and govern the nations of the earth, over whom they preside.*"

Again—1st vol. page 224.

"Legislation should always be national and not individual, instead of which it is more frequently individual than national. *This is not to be wondered at, when we consider what a mass of stupidity and ignorance is ordinarily selected for the administration of public affairs.* It seems almost to have grown into a maxim, that "when a man is fit for nothing else, he is fit for a legislator;" that neither talents, education or experience, are at all necessary to qualify a man to take charge of a nation's interests."

Here Mr. R. asserts, first, that legislators, who, in an humble sense he calls the vicegerents of God on earth, are to govern the nations of the earth, (the American nation being one) "by the laws of eternal justice and wisdom." These being the laws by which God himself governs the world; perfectly unrestrained, free as God himself, judging themselves of the laws of eternal justice and wisdom.

The constitution of the United States, entirely disregarded, and he then tells us, that these vicegerents of God and our legislators, are composed of good-for-nothing fellows ; of a mass of stupidity and ignorance, and that it seems almost to have grown into a maxim, that " when a man is good for nothing else, he is fit for a legislator ; that neither talents, education or experience, are at all necessary to qualify a man to take charge of a nation's interests." These notions would be funny enough, were it not for their serious consequences. But, Mr. Speaker, let me solemnly ask you, Sir, let me solemnly put it to every honourable member of this house, whether he does not think, the government of the United States in a hopeless way, when it consists of God's vicegerents upon earth, clothed with his attributes and powers, in regard to the people over whom they preside, and that the administrators, are the most good-for-nothing fellows in society ; and could it have been expected, that any American citizen could be found, so degenerate and daring ; as publicly to avow these preposterous notions to the world ; and Sir, still more wonderful and alarming, that the practical administration should give its awful sanction to these notions, both by its professions, and measures!!! But without further comment, I will follow Mr. R., in his 2d Vol. to his chapter on protecting duties ; written evidently to promote the passage of the tariff bill in the ensuing year. He, himself, states the object of this chapter in the following words :

Extract—2d vol. page 200.

"It is not my intention to discuss the merits of this particular question. Whether the present tariff ought to be raised or lowered, depends upon particular local circumstances, which are perpetually varying, and upon a vast variety of facts, not within my knowledge and respecting which, I have no means of informing myself. *All that I propose to do, is to ascertain and illustrate the principles upon which this and all other questions like this, ought to be decided.* When these principles shall be established, any man by referring to a complete statistical table, will be able to determine, whether a tariff is too high or too low." Mr. R. then proceeds to give you the following powers, as essentially necessary for every government to possess, before it can be warranted in passing the tariff bill. In this opinion, I strictly concur with Mr. R. and it is the only one, in which I do concur, in his two vols., so far as they speak of the civil institutions of his country. Taking these notions, in connexion with the avowed approbation of the practical administration, I deem them too important to be abridged ; and here insert them in extenso :—

Extract—2d vol. pages 222, 225 inclusive.

"In military tactics, it is a fundamental principle, that the army is one and the general the head ; no soldier is permitted to have a right, or an interest, opposed to the general good of the army. So, in political economy, it should be a fundamental principle, *that the nation is one, and the legislature the head* ; no citizen should be permitted to have a right, or an interest, opposed to the general good of the nation. Until this comes to be admitted, and acted upon, as a fundamental principle, political economy will remain in its present crude, chaotic state, and cannot be subjected to the rules of science.

" It may, with as much propriety, be maintained, that the power and capacity of an army would be augmented, by permitting every soldier to exercise and employ his military skill, and prowess, in what way he pleases, as that the power and capacity of a nation will be augmented, by permitting every citizen to employ his skill, industry and capital in what way he pleases. The rights and duties of a general, and his soldiers, are totally distinct, and frequently opposite. The rights, and duties of a legislature, and its citizens, are as distinct, and scarcely less frequently opposite. *The soldier should have as much liberty, as is consistent with the good of the army.* It would be oppression to deprive him of this. *The citizen should have as much liberty as is consistent with the good of the nation.* To deprive him of this, would be tyranny. More than this, he ought not to claim. *The general is the judge in the case of the soldier.* *The legislature is the judge in the case of the citizen.* Soldiers take all the liberty their general will give them. Citizens take all the liberty the law allows them ; they were never known to refrain from engaging in any profitable trade, or business, which the law allowed, because it was detrimental to the nation. If the slave-trade is profitable, they will engage in it, unless the law forbids it, and often even then. If they refrain at all, when there is no law against it, it will be from other, and higher motives, than regard to the nation's welfare ; and it will be the same with every other kind of trade, or employment.

" We often hear people talk about individual rights, in a strain, that would lead one to suppose, that national interests, and individual rights, were, in their opinion, often at variance. They seem to suppose, that the right of property is absolute in the individual ; and that every one has a right to sell, to whom he pleases, and to buy of whom he pleases ; and that any interference by the government, in restraining the exercise of this right, is arbitrary and tyrannical. *They will tell us, government has no right to control them in the disposition of their property, merely with a view, that other citizens may derive a benefit from it.*

" *This is a manifest error.* Individual right to property is never absolute, but always relative and conditional. *There is no such thing as perfect, absolute right, but in those things, which are the gift of nature : such as life, liberty, strength, talents, personal beauty, &c.* The right to property, is merely conventional or conditional, subject to such regulations as may be made respecting it, with a view to the general interest of the whole nation. No man has, or can have, a perfect exclusive right to property of any description. Every man in the community, has a qualified right to it, and under certain circumstances, has a right to a living out of it. The public right to every piece of property in the nation, is superior to the private right of the individual owner. Hence the right of the public to take any man's property from him, whenever it becomes necessary for the public good. If this were not so, the social compact would not be sustained, government could not be supported.

" If individual right to property was absolute, government would have no right to take an individual's property from him, for any purpose whatever. *The public has no right to deprive a man of his life, his liberty, his talents, his strength, his personal beauty, or of any other gift of nature, merely for the public good, and for the plainest reason*

in the world, because he does not derive any of these from the public. They are the gifts of his Creator, and HE alone has a right to deprive him of them. No man, or body of men, has a right to take them from him, unless they have been forfeited by some crime.

“Upon the same principle that God has a right to deprive a man of health and life, government has a right to deprive him of his property. The former is the bounty of God, and held subject to his will. The latter is the bounty of the government and held subject to its will. But for the social compact, no man could have an exclusive right to any spot of earth. The right of property is therefore a conventional right, and the public grants no title to property in derogation to the public weal. An individual may have a title to property, superior to the title of any other individual, or to any number of individuals, less than the whole, because the whole, includes the title of the individual himself as well as the title of every body else. Hence the right of the public to take a man’s property for the purpose of making public roads, or erecting fortifications, or for any other purpose, which the public good may require. Hence the right to prohibit a man from selling his property to foreigners, or to buy from them those things he may want. The government has a clear and perfect right to make any regulations respecting property, or trade, which the public interests may require.

“Every question, therefore, respecting a tariff, or protecting duties, must be a question of expediency and not a question of right.”

Mr. Speaker,—In the foregoing quotations, you have, in one compact view, the doctrinal notions upon which the general government asserts the power to pass the tariff bill.—R. says, “all I propose to do, is, to ascertain and illustrate the principles upon which this (the passage of the tariff bill) and all other questions like this, ought to be settled.” Let me beg you most earnestly, Sir, to look well at these principles, so called by the author, and imagine, if you can, “principles” more despotic? The imagination of man, can conceive of no governmental powers, nor of individual slavery, beyond those embraced within the author’s “principles”—The citizen has the same liberty from the legislator that the soldier has from his general. The legislator is God’s vicegerent on earth—and governs the nations over whom he presides, by the same laws by which God governs the world; His supreme, uncontrollable will. Although this legislator is a good-for-nothing fellow, “destitute of talents, education and experience,” he is relied upon to better the condition of the people, according to his own supreme uncontrollable will. But this is not the worst nor the most alarming of these preposterous doctrines.—R. asserts, “the public right, to every piece of property in the nation, is superior to the private right of the individual owner. “Hence the right of the public to take any man’s property from him.” Again—“upon the same principle that God has a right to deprive a man of health and life, government has a right to deprive him of his property; the former is the bounty of God, and subject of his will; the latter is the bounty of government, and subject to its will”!!! In this single false hypothesis you can but see, Mr. Speaker! not only the subversion, but the complete inversion of the great American principle of the natural rights of man, and of every American civil institution, founded upon that great fundamental principle. That great prin-

ciple is; that private property is a natural right, the gift of God, and that the owner cannot be deprived of it by government, even for public use, without just compensation to the individual owner. Behold the contrast. Deeply reflect upon the consequences of the practical operation of these contrasted hypothesis. But sir, I am sure you are at this moment distrustingly putting this question to me—Is it possible, that the practical government of the United States, in open defiance of the great American principle, claims the power of administering this government upon the hypothesis, that the aggregate proceeds of the labor of this nation belongs to the government, to be distributed amongst the individuals of the nation, according to the uncontrollable will of the administration, regardless of individual ownership!!! That all property is the bounty of government, not the gift of God!!! Yes, sir, I answer positively in the affirmative, according to my best understanding of their own avowals. This doctrine is avowed by Mr. Clay in his speech on the tariff—by Mr. Adams in his message, and by Mr. Rush in his official report, and that it is the hypothesis on which, the practical government is administered at this moment—Extract from Mr. Clay's speech page 19: “*The great desideratum in political economy*, is the same as in private pursuits: that is, *what is the best application of the aggregate industry of a nation, that can be made honestly to produce the largest sum of national wealth?* *Labor is the source of all wealth, but it is not natural labor only.*” It is then all labor, natural and artificial. It is impossible, not to discern here, an express identity in Mr. Clay's hypothesis, with Mr. R's. It is only ushered forth, with more abstraction, but that admits of only one analysis—Raymond says, “The public right to every piece of property, is superior, to the private right of the owner. That government has a right to deprive him (the owner) of his property. The latter (private property) is the bounty of the government, and subject to its will!!!” What says Mr. Clay? “*The great desideratum in political economy, is the best application of the aggregate industry of a nation.*”

Labor is the source of wealth—not natural labor only—“labor then is the source of all national wealth, arising from national industry—and this *national industry is the great desideratum in political economy*, in making the best application of it, to produce the largest sum of national wealth.” No, Mr. Clay, I positively deny your great political dogma. I here assert, that according to our social compact and federative government, *the great desideratum in political economy does not consist of the aggregate industry of a nation—of the aggregate proceeds of the whole labor of society—but only of the smallest portion of that aggregate industry; that aggregate labor, that can honestly be made to suffice for governmental objects, according to the specific provisions of our fundamental institutions.* All the residue is sacredly secured to the individual owner, against the lawless encroachments of the government. That private property shall not be taken for public use, without just compensation, is the *great desideratum in American political economy*. So far from plundering the individual of his property, the first obligation of the government is to protect him in the uncontrollable use of it, upon condition, that he thereby hurt not another. To whom does the power belong, to make the most beneficial application of the proceeds

of the whole labor of a nation? Surely to the government—according to Mr. Clay. No individual can make it. This power is the great desideratum in political economy; of course belonging to the political body. Upon what ground is this power claimed by the government? There can be but one, that is ownership. Here, then, Mr. Clay is in strict union with Raymond—to wit: The public right to every piece of property in the nation; and the government, upon that ground, “ownership,” has a right to make the best application of the aggregate proceeds of the labor of society, so as to produce the greatest sum of public good, utterly regardless of private ownership. No restraint imposed upon the government. The aggregate products to be applied according to its supreme uncontrollable will. Here, then, is the ground upon which Mr. C. himself places the right to pass the tariff bill; and it is the only ground upon which its passage could be justified. The constitution of the United States is totally disregarded—Mr. Clay scarcely deigns to mention it; and when he does, with a view to argument, it is evidently with sneering contempt and obloquy, not condescending to consult its specified provisions for restraining the will of the government, and securing the liberties of the people. Mr. Speaker, let me here solemnly invoke your attention, and ask you, sir, are you prepared for this? Are you prepared to see the great principle for the security of human rights inverted by the substitution of one, for the unlimited power of government? And let me emphatically ask, for what, and for whose good? Merely to administer to the blind avarice, and greedy cupidity of the favored manufacturing class, so as to secure its support for any govermental usurpation whatever; done too, at the expense of all other occupations in society. It is to do an act of great national injustice. To set moral sentiment at defiance—to introduce cunning and plunder in place of industry and honesty—an open war of discordant original interests; and through this elementary war of jarring atoms, to pave the way for the disunion of the United States! Mr. Speaker, let me again beg you, sir, not to permit your mind to be drawn from this view of the subject. Listen not, sir, to the ingenious tales of the counteractions of foreign nations—to nick-names—to misnomers—to deceptive calculations grounded upon fallacious statistics; nor to any one of the numerous devices, invented to divert your mind from its true object. These will inevitably lead you into error. The real question is *too simple and plain* not to be understood by every sound organized mind in America. It is this: “Is the aggregate labor of this nation, the great desideratum for political economy?” Has government the right to the aggregate products of the nation? If so, from what source does this right accrue to the government? Is private property the bounty of government; or the gift of God? Deem me not too importunate sir, when I beg you, again, not to permit your mind to be drawn away, from the contemplation of this great subject. The rights, the liberties of man depend upon it. Sir, I mean to be tedious upon this point. My great object is, to attract to it the public attention. I shall stick to it, and reiterate it. Nothing else can be wanting to doom the monstrous, frightful hypothesis, to destruction and abhorrence. I shall introduce it again, in other parts of my remarks. In the mean time, hear your President, upon this point; hear, not only his

inofficial avowals; but his proclamation of these despotic doctrines in his official message:

FROM PRESIDENT ADAMS' MESSAGE—1825.

Extract 1st—from the exordium.

“Europe, with a few partial and unhappy exceptions, has enjoyed ten years of peace, during which all her governments, whatever the theory of their constitutions may have been, are successively taught to feel that the end of their institution is the happiness of the people; and that the exercise of power among men can be justified only by the blessings it confers upon those over whom it is extended.”

Extract 2d—4 columns from the first.

“And no government, in whatever form constituted, can accomplish the lawful ends of its institution, but in proportion as it improves the condition of those over whom it is established. Roads and canals by multiplying and facilitating the communications and intercourse between distant regions, and multitudes of men, are among the most important means of improvement. But moral, political, intellectual improvement, are duties assigned, by the author of our existence, to social, no less than to individual man.”

Extract 3rd.

“In assuming her station among the civilized nations of the earth, it would seem that our country had contracted the engagement to contribute her share of mind, of labor and of expense to the improvement of those parts of knowledge which lie beyond the reach of individual acquisition; and particularly to geographical and astronomical science. Looking back to the history only of the half century since the declaration of our independence, and observing a generous emulation with which the governments of France, Great Britain, and Russia, have devoted the genius, the intelligence, the treasures of their respective nations, to the common improvement of the species in these branches of science, is it not incumbent upon us to inquire whether we are not bound by obligations of a high and honorable character, to contribute our portion of energy and execution, to the common stock? The voyages of discovery, prosecuted in the course of that time, at the expense of those nations, have not only redounded to their glory, but to the improvement of human knowledge. We have been partakers of that improvement, and owe for it, a sacred debt not only of gratitude but of equal or proportional exertion in the same common cause.”

Extract 4th.

“It is with no feeling of pride, as an American that the remark may be made, that on the comparatively small territorial surface of Europe there are existing upwards of one hundred and thirty of these light houses of the skies; while throughout the whole American hemisphere, there is not one. If we reflect a moment upon the discoveries, which, in the last four centuries, have been made in the physical constitution of the universe, by the means of these buildings, and of observers stationed in them, shall we doubt of their usefulness to every nation? And while scarcely a year passed over our heads without bringing some new astronomical discovery to light, which we must fain receive at second hand from Europe, are we not cutting ourselves off from the means of returning light for light, while we have neither observatory nor obser-

vers upon our half of the globe, and the earth revolves in perpetual darkness to our unsearching eyes."

Extract 5th.

"The spirit of improvement is abroad upon the earth. It stimulates the heart, and sharpens the faculties, not of our fellow-citizens alone, but of the nations of Europe and of their rulers. While dwelling with pleasing satisfaction upon the superior excellence of our political institutions, *let us not be unmindful that liberty is power; that the nation blest with the largest portion of liberty, must in proportion to its numbers, be the most powerful nation upon earth; and that the tenure of power by man, is, in the moral purposes of his Creator, upon condition that it shall be exercised to ends of beneficence, to improve the condition of himself and his fellow men.* While foreign nations, less blessed with that freedom which is power than ourselves, are advancing with gigantic strides in the career of public improvement, were we to slumber in indolence, fold up our arms and proclaim to the world that we are palsied by the will of our constituents, would it not be to cast away the bounties of Providence, and doom ourselves to perpetual inferiority."

Extract from the Ohio Letter.

The opinion of John Quincy Adams, on the subject of Internal Improvement—1824.

"The question of the power of Congress to authorise the making of internal improvements, is in other words, a question whether the people of this Union, in forming their common social compact, as avowedly for the purpose of promoting their general welfare, have performed their work in a manner *so ineffably stupid* as to deny themselves the means of bettering their own condition. I have too much respect for the intellect of my country to believe it. The first object of human association is the improvement of the condition of the associated. Roads and canals are among the most essential means of improving the condition of nations, and a people, which should deliberately, by the organization of its authorised power, deprive itself of the faculty of multiplying its own blessings; would be as wise as a creator who should undertake to constitute a human being without a heart."

[*Ohio National Crisis.*

Extract from Message—1825.

"But, if the power to exercise legislation in all cases whatsoever, over the District of Columbia; if the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States; if the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes; to fix the standard of weights and measures; to establish post offices and post roads; to declare war, to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a navy—to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States—and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying these powers into execution; if these powers and others enumerated in the constitution, may be effectually brought into action by the laws promoting the improvement of agriculture, commerce and manufactures, the cultivation and encouragement of the mechanic and of the elegant arts, the ad-

vancement of literature and the progress of the sciences, ornamental and profound—to refrain from exercising them for the benefit of the people themselves, would be to hide in the earth the talent committed to our charge—would be treachery to the most sacred of trusts."

Again, from his late message of the 5th:

"In the present instance, it is my duty to say, that if the legislative and executive authorities of the State of Georgia should persevere in acts of encroachment upon the territories, secured by a solemn treaty to the Indians, and the laws of the Union, remain unaltered, *a super-added obligation, even higher than that of human authority* will compel the Executive of the United States to enforce the laws and fulfil the duties of the nation, by all the force committed for that purpose to his charge."

The government only can direct the aggregate industry of a nation, and, to enable it to do so, must be entitled to the proceeds of that aggregate industry.

The President asserts this principle in the following words:

Extract from his Ohio Letter.

"The question of the power of Congress to authorise the making of internal improvements, is, in other words, a question whether the people of this Union, in forming their common social compact, as avowedly for the purpose of promoting their general welfare, have performed their work in a manner, *so ineffably stupid*, as to deny themselves the means of bettering their own condition. I have too much respect for the intellect of my country to believe it."

These means can be nothing short of the whole property of the nation.

Mr. Speaker,—May I be permitted, sir, to justify myself for this great consumption of time in long quotations? My justification will be found in the magnitude of the subject. It is a question involving all human rights, all human liberties. It is all important, that it should be well understood. Let us not then, sir, grudge a little time, nor even much deep, profound reflection; nor a lavish waste of words, pen, ink and paper; besides, I fear the possibility of doing injustice in representing the opinions of your President, and therefore, determined that he shall make his own representation, of his own doctrines; and, sir, to what do they amount? Precisely to Raymon's doctrines. The unlimited will of the government controlling the whole property of the nation for the purposes of beneficence. For the purposes of bettering the condition of the people, regardless of their will. If you, sir, will give your own attention to these doctrines of your President, proclaimed as fundamental laws, for the observance of the practical government, you cannot avoid seeing claims set up, in various forms, to unlimited power, derived from sources paramount to the constitution. In that case no farther analysis from me could be necessary. But, sir, I cannot now take leave of this quotation, without emphatically calling your attention to an analysis of the following most extraordinary exposition, proclaimed in the message. It requires some analysis. It is impossible that it can be understood by the American people at this time.

“Let us not be unmindful that *liberty* is *power*; that the nation, (alias government, not individuals,) blest with the largest portion of liberty, must, in proportion to its numbers, be the most powerful nation upon earth, and that *the tenure of power by man, is, in the moral purposes of his Creator*, (tenure of power again by divine right,) *is, upon condition that it shall be exercised to acts of beneficence, to improve the condition of himself and his fellow men*—(power from the Creator, unrestrained in will, to be exercised in beneficence, not carrying into effect the objects of the constitution.) While foreign nations less blessed with that freedom, which is power, than ourselves (a decoy duck) are advancing with gigantic strides, in the career of public improvement; were we to slumber in indolence, fold up our arms, and proclaim to the world that *we are palsied by the will of our constituents, would it not be to cast away the bounties of Providence and doom ourselves to perpetual inferiority?*”

Here, then, sir, we see the will of our constituents officially proclaimed, as the great obstacle to the best administration of our government. Twist it and turn it as you can, it still amounts to the same thing. It is true, this sentence is couched in terms of the most sophisticated abstraction. The best evidence that could be given both of the design, and fears of the author; but its terms cannot be mistaken. The President is comparing the organization of other governments of unlimited power, with ours, of limited power; and substantially declares, that so long, as our practical government, will condescend to be palsied by the will of our constituents, so long it will be inferior to governments not thus condescending. “Inferiority” is a term of comparison. What are the things here compared? Unlimited, with limited governments. The limited government will be doomed to *perpetual inferiority, provided the administrators shall suffer themselves to be palsied by the will of their constituents*. I defy the veriest casuist to put any other intelligible construction upon this sophisticated sentence. It will be farther confirmed by critically attending to the previous quotations, most artfully contrived for this result. Here, then, is seen the President’s doctrinal notions for his practical administrative policy—unlimited will, unpalsied by the constitutional will.—Raymond identified—God’s vice-gerents upon earth.

The following claims to power are taken from Mr. Rush’s Report of 1825—approved by the Cabinet:

“To give perfection to the industry of the country;

“To draw out its obvious resources and seek constantly for new ones;

“To augment the number and variety of occupations for its inhabitants;

“To hold out to every degree of labor, and to every modification of skill, its appropriate object and inducements;

“To organize the whole labor of the country;

“To entice into the widest ranges its mechanical and intellectual capabilities;

“To call forth, whatever hidden, latent ingenuity, giving to effort, activity, and to emulation, ardor;

“To create employment for the greatest amount of numbers, by

adapting it to the diversified faculties, propensities and situation of men, so that every particle of ability, every shade of genius, may come into requisition ;

“ To lift up the condition of the country ;
 “ To increase its fiscal energy ;
 “ To multiply the means and sources of its opulence ;
 “ To imbue it with the elements of general as well as lasting strength and prosperity.”

Mr. Speaker, were the American people ever before insulted with such monstrous and preposterous doctrines ? Do they not amount to converting man from a natural being, endowed with rights and attributes from his God, into a mere govermental machine, to be bandied about at the fantastical will and pleasure of the government ? This flighty ephemeral *Æeronaut*, claims not only the control over all the property of the nation, but over the occupations of individuals, over mind and body, with power to lash up his obedient subservient slaves to the exertion of “ every particle of ability, every shade of genius” at the governmental beck ;—and when all this is done, then says the *Æeronaut*—“ The farmer of the United States cannot but perceive that the measure of his prosperity is potentially full!!” Poor deluded, insulted farmer ! ! Ask thyself, is the measure of thy prosperity potentially full ? Will it ever be under such fantastical notions and gilded promises ? The farmer’s prosperity potentially full !! Mr. Speaker ! What potential nonsense !! What potential mischief !! What potential despotism !! Mr. Speaker ! You cannot but perceive, sir, the general tenor and spirit which characterises the whole of these admiuiistrative quotations. You cannot but perceive the identity of the doctrines with those of the tariff encomiasts—to wit : The derivation of powers from sources paramount to the constitution—the utter subversion of all its wholesome restraining provisions, and the substitution of unlimited governmental will in their stead.

Sir, when I look at this vast subject—when I feel my appalling physical debility—when I look to the time already consumed, merely in getting through this exordium—and the arduous and perplexing task I have before me, I am led to despair of my capacity for accomplishing it. But, sir, I consider this the last expiring effort I shall ever be permitted to make, for bringing back the American people to the contemplation of their own first principles—to the contemplation of their own original fundamental laws—for saving American liberties, and with them the liberties of the whole human race. Impelled by the invigorating occasion, I must sir, proceed to exert in this great cause the last particle of mental and physical energy, now left me by an all-wise and indulgent Providence.

Let me, then, call your attention to the doctrines of the tariff bill, as ushered forth by Mr. Clay in his sublimated doctrinal speech.

Before I enter minutely into the examination of the particular parts of Mr. Clay’s speech, I beg to be indulged in a few critical observations upon its general characteristics. In the first place, then, notwithstanding Mr. Clay had taken the precaution, to send up the most fervent invocations to the “ Most High,” for his divine inspiration, his burning incense seemed not to be an acceptable, holy offering, since his

anxious prayers proved unavailing; for after all these devotional efforts, I consider Mr. Clay's speech not to be the speech of a statesman —still less the speech of the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The speech of the dignified Speaker of the House, should itself, be dignified. It should be liberal, candid and impartial. It ought to present a fair view of the question on both sides; and the grounds of the balance of his own motives, in favor of the side he deemed the right one. This speech partakes nothing of dignity, liberality, impartiality, or candor. It is below the level of the speech of dignified counsel, learned in the law, who feel a due regard for their honorable professional standing. It is the speech of a pleading lawyer, who has engaged with his client for a high fee, in a bad cause, to gain it right or wrong; and who feels himself under an obligation to call, into the most active exertion, all his powers of chicanery, and special pleading: Accordingly, Mr. Clay condescends to resort to false names, to misrepresentations, to concealment of parts of a connected system of facts, and of every other device to gain his cause, which his inflated imagination could invent. Mr. Clay's fee was great, though contingent—no less his prize than the Presidential Chair. As one conspicuous example of these devices, Mr. Clay nick-names his speech *in the very frontispiece*. He calls it, "Speech in support of an American System, for the protection of American Industry." Mr. Clay well knew that this was a false-nomer. That it was not an American system, for the protection of American industry, that he was recommending; but a discarded *British system of British industry*, he was recommending, to be introduced into the United States for the first time. That it was not "*a genuine American system*," as he sometimes calls it, but an imitative system, drawn from British example, and grounded in British policy. Many other examples of insincerity, and chicanery may be referred to in this most extraordinary speech; some of which will be exposed in its more detailed examination. The present one will suffice, in this general sketch. Its second general characteristic is, that of false coloring, or misrepresentation. Upon a critical investigation, it will be found to be deceptive, and illusory throughout; and, in some instances, the artifices are too slender, to impose upon the plainest understanding—candor is the first quality of true oratory. It will always be in vain, for the orator to attempt to win the hearts of his auditors, whilst they are acting under the conviction, that the orator himself is not sincere—that he does not believe himself—that he is practising upon his own convictions, of his own superior intelligence, and of their ignorance, and credulity. Even such a suspicion would steel the minds of the auditory against conversion, or conviction.

The style of this speech is most peculiarly characteristic. Whilst it violates many of the most obvious rules of criticism, it is so sonorous, turgid and bombastic, that it seems, in its first impressions, to bear down every thing before it, and to cheat the mind of the just exercise of its common faculties. There is a peculiar selection, collocation and arrangement of the words composing each sentence, which produce the loudest and coarsest music. I hope to be excused for the comparison. It may be deemed a coarse one. It is recommended, however, because its intrusion is always involuntary, and therefore must be impelled by

some natural impulse of resemblance. I never commence reading this speech, but the coarse music of the chiming of well regulated church bells instantly appears to strike the tympanum of the ear, and to bewilder the mind with its coarse, sounding, gingling, harmony. But, sir, the resemblance exists only in the music. The coarse music of the church bells passes away, and leaves no trace of mischief behind it. Whilst Mr. Clay's gingling, sonorous speech is said to have produced the tariff—and with it, the total obliteration of every restraining provision in the Constitution. If so, it has produced a mischief, both deplorable, and irremediable; and the gingling, successful orator, will probably live to see the day that he will lament and weep over the fatal success of his own artifices—over the destruction of a federative government, which had, for nearly twenty-five years dispensed the best political blessings over a great nation, now wantonly torn to atoms, by the introduction of warring elements, or moulded into an odious, consolidated mass of despotism. The next characteristic of this gingling speech, consists of its duration, its continuation. It occupies above eight and thirty pages in close print, of a large pamphlet size. These pages form my text. With above 38 pages *for my text*, what must be the *length of my sermon*? It happened to be my fortune in early life, to be placed for my education, under the care of the late celebrated Dr. Witherspoon of Princeton College. The Doctor, although highly learned, was as much celebrated for the simplicity and elegance of his style, and for the brevity of his orations, as for the extent and solidity of his erudition. He lectured the class, of which I was a member, upon eloquence and criticism, and was always delighted with the exercises in that branch of science. Amidst all the refinement of the Doctor's learning, he retained much of the provincial brogue of his native town (Paisley in Scotland). The Doctor generally approached his class with great familiarity, with "How do ye do lads?" to which the reply was, "braly, sir, braly." He commenced his lectures in the simplest style of conversation. "Lads, if it should fall to the lot of any of ye, as it may do, to appear upon the theatre of public life, let me impress upon your minds two rules in oratory, that are never to be departed from upon any occasion whatever—" *Ne'er do ye speak unless ye ha' something to say, and when ye are done, be sure and leave off.*" Frightful restraints upon modern oratory! The Doctor would proceed most methodically to impress upon the class, the sacred inviolability of each of these rules, and the indispensable necessity of their strict observance, by every pretender to oratory. Without positively asserting, that our untiring orator has violated both of these old fashioned oratorical rules, I hazard nothing in saying, that he has said a great deal more than he ought to have said; and he certainly did not leave off when he was fairly done. After saying a great deal more than he ought to have said, and much of which, I think he did not understand himself, he has made ten distinct points, for very little purpose as far as I can comprehend their meaning, except for continuation—for duration. The untiring orator seems to have cleared out on a voyage of many ports, with a determination to preserve its continuity, however unprofitable. Mr. Speaker, I find, sir, at this last stage of life, I am, myself, about to violate, I fear, both these sacred precepts of my beloved and revered preceptor. I

find, for the first time in my life, I shall have to call for an adjourned speech. I find a boundless ocean before me; but, sir, like the untiring, sonorous orator, I clear out for a voyage through this whole immeasurable ocean, and will instantly set sail. Let me then, call your attention more particularly to Mr. Clay's speech. The first eight or nine pages of it, are occupied with exaggerated descriptions, of the sufferings, distresses, and even degradations of the American people; of the depression of prices, and of the vast difference of the advantages of our commerce with European nations, when they are in a state of war; and our commerce with them, when in a state of peace; and finally comes to the profound conclusion, in substance, that our European market in time of peace, is not as good, as it is in time of war. A position which, I suppose, no man of common sense ever doubted, without deriving his information from fantastical statements, founded on delusive statistics. I will here briefly notice a few remarks, introduced by our orator, without designating his object, because, whilst they will furnish one example, of his many equivocations, they leave us in some doubt, as to his notions of the banking system as a necessary desideratum in his political economy.

Extract—page 12.

“ Let us suppose, Mr. Chairman, that Europe was again the theatre of such a general war as recently raged throughout all her dominions, such a state of war as existed in her greatest exertions and in our greatest prosperity: instantly there would arise a greedy demand for the surplus produce of our industry, for our commerce, for our navigation. The languor which now prevails in our cities, and in our sea-ports, would give way to an animated activity. Our roads and rivers would be crowded with the produce of the interior. Every where we should witness excited industry. The precious metals would re-flow from abroad upon us. *Banks, which have maintained their credit, would revive their business; and new banks would be established, to take the place of those which have sunk beneath the general pressure.* For it is a mistake to suppose that they have produced our present adversity; they may have somewhat aggravated it, but they were the effect and the evidence of our prosperity.” Now, permit me to ask you, Mr. Speaker, or the splendid orator's most partial friend, whether he really does consider banking as one of the necessary desiderata in his political economy? He seems to think, but most equivocally to express the opinion, that new banks ought to be established, to take place of those which have sunk under the general pressure. This would seem to place the orator amongst the supporters of the Kentucky relief schemes, even after they had turned the morals of Kentucky topsy turvey.—Although it is admitted that his meaning is too vaguely and deceptively expressed, to justify any certain conclusion respecting it. But let that be admitted under these laborious demonstrations, which I believe was never denied, that our European peace market is not as good as our European war market, will that admission afford an argument in favor of laying a high tariff on European goods? Mr. Clay says yes—common sense says no. Will not increasing the tariff make the bad European market worse? Would not common sense say, that it would be true policy to make it better, if it were policy to tamper with it at all? But

all just inferences seem to be inverted by the enchanted, sonorous orator. Because the European peace market is bad, *therefore* the sagacious orator would make it worse. This he would do by lessening its capacity to purchase; *therefore* common sense would say it ought to be made better by enlarging its capacity to purchase. But, sir, all these artificial contrivances tend to invert all just inferences. The claiming orator would doubtlessly conceive he had achieved a wonderful manœuvre for bettering the condition of the people, by placing the nation in the artificial attitude of "heels over head," instead of permitting it to retain the natural one of "head over heels." He doubtlessly thinks the nation would be placed in a much better condition in its artificial than in its natural attitude; to exert its faculties in the application of its labor, for increasing the national wealth and prosperity, by artificially placing manufactures at the head, and agriculture at the heels, of all occupations in society, instead of leaving agriculture in its natural position, "head over heels." Without further attention to the collateral, incidental points, contained in the first nine pages, I will proceed at once to the examination of the principal errors which, most unfortunately, led to the adoption of this most fatal measure, and into the still more fatal doctrines upon which it is founded.

Extract—page 19.

"But Britain is herself the most striking illustration of the immense power of machinery. Upon what other principle can you account for the enormous wealth which she has accumulated, and which she annually produces? A statistical writer of that country, several years ago, estimated the total amount of the artificial or machine labor of the nation, to be equal to that of one hundred millions of able-bodied laborers. Subsequent estimates of her artificial labor, at the present day, carry it to the enormous height of two hundred millions. But the population of the three kingdoms is 21,500,000. Supposing that to furnish able-bodied labor to the amount of four millions, the natural labor will be but two per cent. of the artificial labor. In the production of wealth, she operates, therefore, by a power (including the whole population) of 221,500,000; or, in other words, by a power eleven times greater than the total of her natural power. If we suppose the machine labor of the United States to be equal to that of 10,000,000 of able-bodied men, the United States will operate, in the creation of wealth, by a power (including all their population) of 20,000,000. In the creation of wealth, therefore, the power of Great Britain, compared to that of the United States, is as eleven to one. That these views are not imaginary, will be, I think, evinced, by contrasting the wealth, the revenue, the power of the two countries. Upon what other hypothesis can we explain those almost incredible exertions which Britain made during the late wars of Europe? Look at her immense subsidies! Behold her standing, unaided and alone, and breasting the storm of Napoleon's colossal power, when all continental Europe owned and yielded to its irresistible sway; and finally contemplate her vigorous prosecution

of the war, with and without allies, to its splendid termination, on the ever memorable field of Waterloo!"

Again—page 21.

"If we look at the commerce of England, we shall perceive that its prosperous condition no less denotes the immensity of her riches. The average of three years exports, ending in 1789, was between 13 and 14 millions. The average for the same term ending in 1822, was 40 millions sterling. The average of the imports for three years, ending in 1789, was seventeen millions. The average for the same term, ending in 1822, was thirty-six millions, showing a favorable balance of four millions. Thus, in a period not longer than that which has elapsed since the establishment of our constitution, have the exports of that kingdom been tripled; and this has mainly been the effect of the power of machinery. The total amount of the commerce of Great Britain is greater since the peace, by one fourth, than it was during the war. The average of her tonnage, during the most flourishing period of the war, was two million four hundred thousand tons. Its average, during the three years, 1819, 1820, and 1821, was 2,600,000; exhibiting an increase of 200,000 tons. If we glance at some of the more prominent articles of her manufactures, we shall be assisted in comprehending the true nature of the sources of her riches. The amount of cotton fabrics exported, in the most prosperous year of the war, was eighteen million sterling. In the year 1820, it was 16,600,000; in 1821, 21,500,000; in 1822, 21,639,000*l.* sterling; presenting the astonishing increase in two years of upwards of five millions. The total amount of imports in Great Britain from all foreign parts, of the article of cotton wool, is five millions sterling. After supplying most abundantly the consumption of cotton fabrics within the country (and a people better fed and clad and housed, are not to be found under the sun, than the British nation,) by means of her industry, she gives to this cotton wool a new value, which enables her to sell to foreign nations to the amount of 21,639,000*l.*, making a clear profit of upwards of 16,500,000*l.* sterling! In 1821, the value of the export of woollen manufactures was 4,300,000*l.* In 1822, it was 5,500,000*l.*"

Again—page 21, 22.

"The amount of her wealth annually produced, is three hundred and fifty millions sterling; bearing a large proportion to all of her pre-existing wealth. The agricultural portion of it is said by the gentleman from Virginia, to be greater than that created by any other branch of her industry. But that flows mainly from a policy similar to that proposed by this bill. One-third only of her population is engaged in agriculture; the other two-thirds furnishing a market for the produce of that third. Withdraw this mar-

ket, and what becomes of her agriculture? The power and the wealth of Great Britain cannot be more strikingly illustrated, than by a comparison of her population and revenue with those of other countries and with our own. [Here Mr. Clay exhibited the following table, made out from authentic materials.]

	<i>Population.</i>	<i>Taxes and public burthens.</i>	<i>Taxation per capita.</i>
Russia in Europe,	37,000,000	£18,000,000	£0 9 9
France, including Corsica,	30,700,000	£37,000,000	£1 4 0
Great Britain, exclusive of Ireland (the taxes computed according to the value of money on the European Continent,)	14,500,000	£40,000,000	£2 15 0
Great Britain and Ireland, collectively,	21,500,000	£44,000,000	£2 0 0
England alone,	11,600,000	£36,000,000	£3 2 0
Spain,	11,000,000	£6,000,000	£0 11 0
Ireland,	7,000,000	£4,000,000	£0 11 0
The United States of America,	10,000,000	£4,500,000	£0 9 0

Again—page 23.

"The views of British prosperity which I have endeavored to present, show that her protecting policy is adapted alike to a state of war and of peace. Self-poised, resting upon her own internal resources, possessing a home market, carefully cherished and guarded, she is ever prepared for any emergency. We have seen her coming out of a war of incalculable exertion, and of great duration, with her power unbroken, her means undiminished. We have seen, that almost every revolving year of peace has brought along with it an increase of her manufactures, of her commerce, and consequently, of her navigation. We have seen that, constructing her prosperity upon the solid foundation of her own protecting policy, it is unaffected by the vicissitudes of other states. What is our own condition? Depending upon the state of foreign powers—confiding exclusively in a foreign, to the culpable neglect of a domestic, policy—our interests are affected by all their movements.—Their wars, their misfortunes, are the only source of our prosperity. In their peace, and our peace, we behold our condition the reverse of that of Great Britain—and all our interests stationary or declining. Peace brings to us none of the blessings of peace. Our system is, anomalous; alike unfitted to general tranquillity, and to a state of war or peace, on the part of our own country. It can succeed only in the rare occurrence of a general state of war throughout Europe. I am no eulogist of England. I am far from recommending her systems of taxation. I have adverted to them only as manifesting her extraordinary ability."

Mr. Speaker,—Look back, sir, at the multiplicity, complexity, and extent of these sonorous statistics; and ask yourself, sir, if they are not

amply sufficient to bewilder, and confound the mind, even in the ordinary exercise of its faculties? What then, is to be expected from their effects upon a mind, already inflated, and sublimated by the glittering prospects before it? With the dazzling prize of the Presidential chair in view; and with the fondest hope of possession, by the happy success of splendid, brilliant displays of oratorical flourishes? Little short of delirium could be expected from a mind in such a state of enchantment. It would surely be quite unreasonable to expect the accuracy of *arithmetical* results; accordingly, the splendid orator seems to be borne aloft by the fascination of the occasion; and to exhibit the wildest, most unfounded, and inconsistent results. It is this wonderful fascination, produced by the external grandeur, and splendor of the British nation, which has led, so many superficial observers, ardently to desire, the introduction of the British system of policy into this country, in the sanguine, patriotic hope, of producing a similar state of things here. But, sir, these superficial observers, have not looked into the interior condition of the British nation and population:—When this is done, all their delusive enchantments, arising from the splendor, the wealth, the prosperity, and the happiness of the British people, will vanish; and they will awake to the reality; that the population of the British nation, is more wretched and miserable, according to numbers, than the population of any nation in Europe. But, before I enter into this investigation, I cannot avoid calling your attention to a few remarks of our orator, which are entirely unaccountable to me. After the high wrought eulogiums, which fill two or three pages, upon the British nation, people, and government, the orator asserts—“I am no eulogist of England.”—No! Mr. Orator! What then are you in relation to England? What then, is the meaning of all the eulogiums, you have pronounced upon England? Look back upon them, sir; and ask yourself, if it be possible to add aught to the eulogiums already pronounced? Why then deny the character you have just played off with so much point and effect? If the sonorous, glowing orator, be no eulogist of England, I should like to see one. I should like to see one, that could outstrip him, not only in portraying the blessings of her incalculable riches, prosperity and happiness; but for her glorious feats in arms, particularly, when contemplating her vigorous prosecution of the war, with and without allies, *to its splendid termination on the ever memorable field of Waterloo!*—with a note of admiration, to mark his wonder, and his pleasure. But still more extraordinary, the orator asserts:—“I am far from recommending her systems of taxation!!” Is that possible, Mr. Orator? Wonderful to be told!!! Why not? Look at the comparative views of her systems of policy, and taxation, with our own, and tell us, why was it made? If not for the purpose of recommending the British system of policy and taxation, why was the dishonorable, and disadvantageous contrast, made in favor of Great Britain against ourselves? I cannot devise any other rational object; and sure I am, if such contrast really do exist; that the splendid orator ought to recommend both policy, and taxation, with all the arguments at his command—Sure I am, that failing to do so, under his convictions would be little short of treachery to his constituents, and to his country. I had supposed, until I was wonder-struck with

this assertion, that the whole force of these unparalleled eulogiums; was urged with the sole view of recommending *that* policy for adoption, to *whose effects*, all these *blessings* were ascribed, and particularly, when in the page preceding, I observe this remark: "The agricultural portion of it is said by the gentleman from Virginia, to be greater, than that created by any other branch of her industry. *But that flows mainly from a policy similar to that proposed by this bill.*" This seems to me to be a direct declaration, not an inference; that the policy proposed by this bill, is *similar* to the pre-existing British policy; of course, imitative—recommended by it, and deducible from it. I should like to know what the splendid orator meant by the introduction of the following observations; if not for the purpose of recommending the imitation of this most wise and beneficial policy, as he describes it to be? Surely, if such be its beneficial effects, it ought not only to be recommended, but the whole mental powers of the orator ought to be exerted in favor of its adoption. Is there nothing seen here like insincerity? like duplicity? urging the strongest possible arguments, for the adoption of a measure. The measure proposed to be adopted, then under consideration, and the assertion made, that he is far from recommending an imitation of British policy, of British systems of taxation. For what other object could these observations have been introduced?

"The object of wise governments should be, by sound legislation, so to protect the industry of their own citizens against the policy of foreign powers, as to give to it the most expansive force in the production of wealth. Great Britain has ever acted, and still acts, on this policy. She has pushed her protection of British interest further than any other nation has fostered its industry. The result is, greater wealth among her subjects and consequently greater obstacles to pay their public burthens.

"The Committee will observe, from that table, that the measure of the wealth of a nation is indicated by the measure of its protection of its industry; and that the measure of the poverty of a nation is marked by that of the degree in which it neglects and abandons the care of its own industry, leaving it exposed to the action of foreign powers. Great Britain protects most her industry, and the wealth of Great Britain is consequently the greatest."

But, Mr. Speaker, look back at the whole comparison made between the British and American nations and population, and ask yourself if you would not conclude, that the British is the wealthiest, the happiest, and most dignified nation—and the American the poorest, the most miserable, and the most degraded nation in the world. Such, certainly, is the picture drawn by the splendid sonorous orator. Under these fascinating descriptions of the unparalleled blessings, enjoyed by British subjects, would you not expect, Mr. Speaker, that the whole American population would fly from their own impoverished and degraded country, and hail with joy their arrival on British shores, to participate in all the liberties and blessings, enjoyed by British subjects in British land. And, yet, sir, such is not the actual course of emigration—but directly the reverse. The British population are, at this moment, fleeing from all these unexampled British blessings; which, although our

orator sees the British subjects enjoying, he is unwilling that American citizens should participate in them. He is so cruel, as not to mean to "recommend" the British system, producing all these ineffable blessings, to the adoption of the American people. - Here, sir, will be found the orator's great mistake in his deduction from his incomprehensible statistics. The British people are the most miserable and wretched people in Europe, according to numbers; and this misery and wretchedness have arisen from the restrictive policy—to which policy, the mistaken orator erroneously ascribes all the glittering, fallacious prosperity, and happiness of the British nation. I will go farther and say, that the American people, if not the most wealthy, according to numbers, are the most independent and happy people—and always will remain so, until cheated out of their political blessings by huckstering and bargaining. If such should turn out to be the case, how unfortunate must the splendid orator have been, in his deductions from his sonorous complicated statistics. It is not difficult to account for the unfortunate misconceptions and delusions of the superficial sounding orator. He has looked to the whole British population in mass, without taking the trouble of separating them into different classes and orders, conformably to the practical organization of the British government. Let me, then, perform this task, which has been omitted by the orator, and it will be found that the British population, consisting of 21 millions in the whole, are divided into nabobs and paupers. The middling class being almost annihilated by unwise governmental tampering, and intermeddling in various ways; and nothing has been more instrumental in producing this result, than the extensive and long continued restrictive system. Of this large mass of population, 280,000 possess all the income of the country, whilst 20,720,000, are in a state of pauperism in various degrees. What a mass of human misery, compared with the mass of human prosperity! Perhaps, almost as little real happiness is to be found in one of these extreme conditions as the other. I am so fortunate as to speak with some degree of certainty upon this point. I have, within a short time, received a very able expose, upon popular education, from the Whig Society of Princeton, delivered by Mr. C. F. Mercer, at the request of both of the Societies of that College, which contains the substance of a report made by a society of gentlemen in London, upon the actual condition of the British population; Headed "every line a moral"—"Every page a history"—I now beg leave to read from it a copious quotation. Its contents are all important to the American people at this moment, before they are hurried by fallacious appearances, and false calculations, to the adoption of the antiquated, destructive British restrictive system.

"There were returned to the British Parliament in 1824, for England and Wales, but 120,000 qualified jurors out of a population which exceeded twelve and a half millions. Of the funded public debt due from the twenty-one millions of people inhabiting Great Britain and Ireland, amounting to seven hundred and thirty-seven, out of eight hundred and thirty-eight millions of pounds sterling, or to 3,275 millions of dollars, 280,000 persons are entitled to the whole, and consequently to the annually accruing interest upon it, of 115,500,000 dollars. These classes are not composed of distinct persons, since the

fundholder is often a freeholder too, and they together own the far greater proportion, not only of the unfunded debt of nearly 450 millions more, but of all the moveable property of the nation. Behold in these particulars, therefore, a part of the evidences of the overgrown wealth of the rich.

"Of the number and indigence of the poor, sum up the melancholy testimony, that at the period of the last British census, the occupants of three-fourths of the inhabited houses of England and Wales, were unable to contribute to direct taxation—that for a series of years, more than two-fifths of all the families who dwell in those habitations, amounting to five millions of people were dependent for permanent or occasional relief upon the constrained charity of the residue—that in some counties the relieved paupers comprised three-fourths of the entire population, and of the whole number of paupers provided for, more than ninety thousand families were actually in work-houses.

"In the eight years next preceding this census, the committals for crime among this population mounted up from six thousand five hundred and seventy-five, to thirteen thousand one hundred and fifteen, or very nearly doubled; and in 1823, or two years after that census, the total county levy for the maintenance of jails, and houses of correction, approached in amount near a million of dollars.

"From the prevalence of pauperism and crime in a country, in which, of an annual expenditure of near three hundred millions of dollars, not one cent is bestowed on public education; the state of knowledge among the great body of the community might be confidently inferred, if a yet more remarkable fact was not supplied in the extent and application of the only legal provision for the poor themselves. In addition to the preceding national expenditure, for a series of many years, an average annual sum amounting to near twenty-six millions of dollars, has been levied in the several counties of England and Wales, for the clothing and subsistence of their indigent poor, while of this fund no part whatever has been bestowed upon their instruction. During this period the annual average of all the charitable donations from every other source to this object, has not much exceeded \$330,000."

Mr. Speaker,—I sincerely regret, sir, to be compelled to inform you, that I am physically exhausted, and reading, whilst engaged in speaking, is at all times particularly embarrassing to me: at present, sir, it is almost insupportable. Reading this long quotation, has absolutely put it out of my power to proceed. May I then ask the indulgence of the House, for the first time in my life, to postpone the discussion 'till to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker: I find myself this morning, in an unaccustomed dilemma. I find myself sir, progressing with a speech, which has already nearly exhausted the preceding day. I find too, sir, a great portion of the task, marked out for myself, still unaccomplished; and, sir, I acknowledge, that it appears too much like presumption on my part, to ask your kind indulgence for time to complete it. But, sir, I am impelled to proceed, from the conviction; that the subject is of the deepest interest to us all; to the whole human race; and at the same time, I labor under an equally strong conviction;

that the momentous subject has not been sufficiently considered ; and that it is not generally understood by the American people. The most glimmering light, therefore, that could be thrown upon it, ought not to be withheld from them. I read you sir, yesterday, an authentic document, containing the most important information, bearing directly upon this subject. It is, information recently obtained, and but little known, even to the well informed in this country. I, therefore, presume it would not be unacceptable to the House, that I should read it again, connected with some additional sections. These sections, are as follow :

“ If, therefore, an unparalleled accumulation of riches and power in all the forms most attracting to ordinary ambition, were a just standard of national happiness, the people of Great Britain, and especially of England, who govern the residue of this mighty empire, would be the most blessed on earth. Their present lot does indeed present the most splendid exhibition that the world has ever witnessed of the triumph of commerce in amassing wealth, but at the same time it is the most alarming evidence of the possible inequality of its distribution, and of the consequent prevalence of want, ignorance, vice, and misery.”

It cannot escape observation, that here, the astonishing wealth of Great Britain, is ascribed to the operations of commerce ; not to the restrictive system, which is at open war, with every attribute, and principle of commerce.

“ There were returned to the British Parliament in 1824, for England and Wales, but 120,000 qualified jurors out of a population which exceeded twelve and a half millions. Of the funded public debt due from the twenty-one millions of people inhabiting Great Britain and Ireland, amounting to seven hundred and thirty-seven, out of eight hundred and thirty-eight millions of pounds sterling, or to 3,275 millions of dollars, 280,000 persons are entitled to the whole, and consequently to the annually accruing interest upon it, of 115,500,000 dollars. These classes are not composed of distinct persons, since the fundholder is often a freeholder too, and they together own the far greater proportion, not only of the unfunded debt of nearly 450 millions more, but of all the moveable property of the nation. Behold in these particulars, therefore ; a part of the evidences of the overgrown wealth of the rich.

“ Of the number and indigence of the poor, sum up the melancholy testimony that, at the period of the last British census, the occupants of three-fourths of all the inhabited houses in England and Wales, were unable to contribute to direct taxation :—that for a series of years, more than two-fifths of all the families who dwell in those habitations, amounting to five millions of people, were dependent for permanent or occasional relief upon the constrained charity of the residue :—that in some counties the relieved paupers comprised three-fourths of the entire population, and of the whole number of paupers provided for, more than ninety thousand families were actually in work-houses.

“ In the eight years next preceding this census, the committals

for crime among this population mounted up from six thousand five hundred and seventy-five, to thirteen thousand one hundred and fifteen, or very nearly doubled; and in 1823, or two years after that census, the total county levy for the maintenance of jails, and houses of correction, approached in amount near a million of dollars.

“From the prevalence of pauperism and crime in a country, in which, of an annual expenditure of near three hundred millions of dollars, not one cent is bestowed on public education; the state of knowledge among the great body of the community might be confidently inferred, if a yet more remarkable fact was not supplied in the extent and application of the only legal provision for the poor themselves. In addition to the preceding national expenditure, for a series of many years, an average annual sum amounting to near twenty-six millions of dollars, has been levied in the several counties of England and Wales, for the clothing and subsistence of their indigent poor, while of this fund no part whatever has been bestowed upon their instruction. During this period the annual average of all the charitable donations from every other source to this object, has not much exceeded three hundred and thirty thousand dollars.

“It is not therefore at all surprising that the number of uneducated children in England and Wales, between the ages of five and fifteen years, computing those of the relieved poor, exceeds eleven hundred and fifty thousand, while the total number cannot fall far short of two millions. These, but for untimely deaths from accident, famine, and disease, or the fatal penalty of a bloody code of laws, would arrive at manhood untaught, and might die of age without reproof or consolation from the perusal of the oracles of God, which so much is annually expended by the same people, and so usefully too, in translating into foreign languages, and publishing to heathen lands. Amidst this scene of pauperism, ignorance, and crime, but in the absence of foreign war, or of scarcity from ungenerous seasons, in the plenitude of commercial prosperity, and after a great reduction of those taxes hitherto charged on the necessaries of life, spectacles are at this moment presented in England of human calamity more awful than the pestilence which walks unseen by day, and usually sparing the country, smites only towns and cities with death and mourning. Having filled South Britain with distress and alarm, they have extended their awful visitation, though in less threatening forms, to hardy, laborious, and frugal Scotland.

“No augmentation of mechanical power has counteracted, in the least, the dangerous consequences of this inequality of wealth and knowledge. Although the application to the arts of a single agent has superadded the effective operation of a hundred million of hands to the labor of the people of England, and diversified and cheapened the luxurious gratifications of the rich, it has not sensibly increased the leisure, nor multiplied the visible comforts of the poor.

“Machinery, the joint production of wealth and ingenuity, has given new employment to accumulated capital, and much enlarged its vast acquisitions. Aided by the growth of numbers, it has cheapened the wages of labor more than it has added to the *enjoyments* of

the laborer, by reducing *their* cost. By this combined agency, it has increased at the same moment the wealth of the rich, and the indigence of the poor. It has accumulated poverty in greater masses, aggravated its misery, and rendered it more terrific."

Mr. Speaker, let me implore you, sir, to look steadfastly, at the *real picture of the actual condition of the British nation, and population*; and compare it, with the brilliant, delusive, factitious one, exhibited by the splendid orator. Then, mark the contrast! You cannot *then*, avoid seeing, sir, either, that the orator was himself grossly misinformed, of the actual condition of the British nation, and population; or that, he had omitted to give that information, which was most material, to enable others to make a just estimate of it: That his statistics, however sonorous, and redundant, have failed to present its most material features, to the public view. For, suppose the *actual condition* of the British nation, and population, be such, as is here described by an authentic document, which will not be disputed, would it not add a new, deplorable, and destructive feature, to the brilliant, enchanting picture, drawn by our orator?—Would not this feature totally deface all the pristine beauty, and symmetry of the original; and strip it of all its fascinating charms? Would you desire, sir, that the American nation and people should change their present condition for that of the British, under its true, instead of its factitious representation? Pray, sir, examine well, and see, what the condition of the British nation, and population is, which is recommended to our adoption. To save time, take a single feature. Of 21,000,000 of people, 280,000 only, own all the property in the nation; whilst 20,200,000 are destitute of income; and nearly the whole of that immense mass, suffering pauperism, in some degree or other. About 1,500,000 are technically paupers; and five millions, in England and Wales, depend "for permanent or occasional relief upon the constrained charity of the residue." Is this condition of the British population, so desirable, that you wish to assimilate that of the United States to it? That you so ardently wish it, as to sacrifice for these ineffable British blessings, brilliantly pourtrayed and recommended to you by our Orator, all your fundamental laws? All your sacred ramparts, raised for protecting your own greater blessings; and amongst the rest, your own blessed liberties? Yet, sir, you cannot but see, that pauperism, misery, wretchedness, and vice, are largely commixed with the glittering, delusive blessings, promised you through the adoption of the Tariff. The Orator says, in substance, that this condition of the British nation, and people, which he describes as superlatively blessed, is mainly to be ascribed to her restrictive system. The orator says: "Great Britain protects most her industry, and the wealth of Great Britain, is consequently the greatest." Admit the fact, as to the astonishing degree of wealth, what distribution of this mass of indescribable wealth, is made by this protecting policy? By this restrictive system? By the great desideratum of political economy?—"the aggregate wealth of the nation, distributed at the capricious will of the government!" The whole mass, distributed amongst two hun-

dred and eighty thousand, whilst twenty million two hundred thousand are left to starve! What a mass of human misery, compared with this mass of human luxury? Twenty millions, two hundred thousand of wretches, steeped to the lips in poverty—two hundred and eighty thousand noblesse, overwhelmed with luxuries, and riches! Such is the inevitable result of the long continuation of the restrictive, monopolizing system. Its perpetual tendency is, to make the rich richer, and the poor poorer; so much has this been the case, under the natural operation of the British system in the course of two hundred years, that the rich have become so rich, they do not know what to do with their riches; whilst the poor are stript of every comfort, and enjoyment of life, and whilst the middling class of society is almost annihilated. So far then, from the condition of the British people being superlatively blessed, I think it superlatively wretched. It is to this deplorable, miserable condition that you are advised to bring the American population, by the adoption of the same unwise, wicked, and despotic policy, which has produced this effect in Great Britain? It is the simplest thing imaginable to see; how this effect has been produced by British policy. It has been done by assuming a control over all the proceeds of the labor of the country; and distributing them, in such a way, as to take from the productive, and give them to the unproductive laborers; to take from one man, that which he labors for, and give it to another, who labored not for it.

But in Great Britain, *at the present day*, there it not only a reason, but a necessity, for taking from the productive laborer, the whole produce of his labor; and giving it to the unproductive laborer, who does not labor for it; neither this reason, nor necessity does, as yet, apply to this country. The British government, therefore, is under an indispensable obligation to take the whole productive labor of society, for governmental purposes; and is, consequently, excusable for the ruinous plunder; whilst the real legitimate purposes of our government, do not call for the whole productive labor of society; our government, therefore, would be without pretext, or excuse, were it to plunder the whole. But the practical government, not having necessary demands, seems to be engaged in inventing artificial demands, for the purpose of affording a pretext to plunder the whole proceeds of productive labor, as the great desideratum, in their political economy; as the great desideratum, for their individual aggrandisement. In Great Britain, the distribution of the proceeds of labor, is made by tythes, and taxes; and most deplorable for the laboring class, when all the demands for the tythes, and taxes, become satisfied, there is not sufficiency left to furnish the poor operative, with food, and raiment. These demands are said, however, to be indispensable to pay for loans heretofore made, or for services now rendering. After one tenth of the whole productive labor is given to the Priesthood—one million pounds sterling for the King, and his civil list, the expenditures for army and navy, and interest upon the public debt, defrayed, the whole proceeds of the productive labor are gone, so that there is no hope for bettering the condition

of the British people, so long as the present order of things shall remain in that country; a state of things, brought on, mainly, by the restrictive system. The great mass of population must be doomed to pauperism, and starvation. The demands upon the people of the United States, are not yet equal to the whole proceeds of the productive labor of the nation; but the practical government is determined to make it so, by artificial expenditures, and variations in the distributions of labor; by taking from one man, the product of his labor, and giving it to another, who does not labor for it, *without compensation, and not for public use*; by splendid schemes for internal improvements; and by every other species of profligacy, which their imaginations can invent, and which, they believe, the people will bear. Whenever the demands upon the labor of society here, shall absorb the whole proceeds, then will the condition of the population become assimilated to that of the British. Is this the condition, so devoutly wished for? If not, avoid the British restrictive, monopolising system, which has produced it there, and which will produce the same effects in every country, that shall make the experiment. The difference here, then, between the splendid orator and myself, in relation to one point, is reduced to a simple matter of fact. He represents the condition of the British nation, and population, as the most wealthy, the most prosperous, the most splendid, the most powerful, and the most happy in Europe. I represent it, as the most miserable, the most wretched, and the most oppressed people in Europe. His statement applies to 280,000 souls. Mine to 20,200,000—Estimating human happiness, by numbers, which representation is then the true one? Surely, that which goes to describe the condition of the greater numbers. So eager has the splendid orator been, to make, his description of the perfectibility of the British population, complete; that he has not failed to notice their houses, food, and clothing, “and a people better fed, and clad, and housed, are not to be found under the sun, than the British nation!” 20,200,000, I presume, excepted out of the general mass of 21,000,000. Surely 1,500,000 technical paupers ought to be excepted—and the 5,000,000 living upon constrained charity. Now, what says the authentic report, as to food, and raiment?

“In addition to the preceding annual expenditure, for a series of many years, an average *annual sum, amounting to near twenty-six millions of dollars, has been levied in the several counties of England, and Wales, for the clothing, and subsistence of their indigent poor*, while of this fund no part whatever has been bestowed upon their instruction. During this period the annual average of all the charitable donations from every other source to this object, has not much exceeded \$ 330,000.”

Can it be believed, that a population can be well fed, clad, and housed, which requires twenty-six millions of dollars annually, of forced contributions, to furnish food, and raiment to the indigent, and destitute poor? Our Orator, sir, must have confined his brilliant representation, exclusively to the rich. It is readily admitted, that the rich are so rich, that they have not genius enough to know

how to spend their riches; and instead of making themselves happy, have, by luxurious indulgencies, effeminated their mental, and their physical faculties.

Upon a review of all these facts, can you avoid drawing the conclusion, sir, either, that our splendid Orator did not understand the actual condition of the British nation, and population, himself; or if he did understand it; that he has withheld from others, the most material facts, to enable them to understand it? I think one of these conclusions must be undeniable, even by the splendid Orator himself. But I will leave this part of the subject, although far from being exhausted, and proceed to the examination of part of the same statistics, introduced by our Orator for another object; and to prove, still more evidently; that he misconceives, their most obvious bearings, and results.

Extract from Speech,—pages 21, 22.

“The amount of her wealth annually produced, is three hundred and fifty millions sterling; bearing a large proportion to all of her pre-existing wealth. The agricultural portion of it is said by the gentleman from Virginia, to be greater than that created by any other branch of her industry. But that flows mainly from a policy similar to that proposed by this bill. One-third only of her population is engaged in agriculture; the other two-thirds furnishing a market for the produce of that third. Withdraw this market, and what becomes of her agriculture? The power and the wealth of Great Britain cannot be more strikingly illustrated, than by a comparison of her population and revenue with those of other countries and with our own. [Here Mr. Clay exhibited the following table, made out from authentic materials.]

	<i>Population.</i>	<i>Taxes and public burthens.</i>	<i>Taxation per capita.</i>
Russia in Europe,	37,000,000	£18,000,000	10 9 9
France, including Corsica,	30,700,000	£37,000,000	11 4 0
Great Britain, exclusive of Ireland (the taxes computed according to the value of money on the European Continent,)	14,500,000	£40,000,000	12 15 0
Great Britain and Ireland, collectively,	21,500,000	£41,000,000	12 0 0
England alone,	11,600,000	£36,000,000	13 2 0
Spain,	11,000,000	£6,000,000	10 11 0
Ireland,	7,000,000	£4,000,000	10 11 0
The United States of America,	10,000,000	£4,500,000	10 9 0

“From this exhibit, we must remark, that the wealth of Great Britain, (and consequently her power,) is greater, than that of any of the other nations, with which it is compared. The amount of the contributions which she draws from the pockets of her subjects, is not referred to for imitation, but as indicative of their wealth. The burthen of taxation, is always relative to the ability of the subjects of it. A poor nation, can pay but little. And

the heavier taxes of British subjects, for example, in consequence of their greater wealth, may be easier borne, than the much lighter taxes of Spanish subjects, in consequence of their extreme poverty."

And again—page 23.

"The Committee will observe, from that table, that the measure of the wealth of a nation is indicated by the measure of its protection of its industry ; and that the measure of the poverty of a nation is marked by that of the degree in which it neglects and abandons the care of its own industry, leaving it exposed to the action of foreign powers. Great Britain protects most her industry, and the wealth of G. Britain is consequently the greatest ; France is next in the degree of protection, and France is next in the order of wealth. Spain most neglects the duty of protecting the industry of her subjects, and Spain is one of the poorest of European nations. Unfortunate Ireland, disinherited, or rendered in her industry subservient to England, is exactly in the same state of poverty with Spain, measured by the rule of taxation. And the United States are still poorer than either."

The object of our splendid, deluded orator, in introducing this table of statistics, is, "most strikingly to illustrate" the superior comparative power and wealth of Great Britain over all other nations comprehended within the table. For, says our orator, "from this exhibit, we must remark, that the wealth of Great Britain (and consequently her power) is greater than that of any other nation with which it is compared. The amount of the contributions, which she draws from the pockets of her subjects, is not referred to for imitation, but as indicative of her wealth ;" and he states, in the next page, the test of this comparative wealth to be taxation—"measured (says our orator) by the rule of taxation." I have heard of the rule of three, and other rules of proportions, but never before heard of the rule of taxation, as a measure of wealth. But sir, however wealthy and powerful Great Britain may be, I peremptorily deny that taxation, and particularly the taxation contained in the statistical table, is any test whatever, either of that wealth, or of the relative wealth and prosperity, of the several nations mentioned in the table ; or of the relative ability of the inhabitants of each to pay taxes. The table does not state the fact, that any one of the governments mentioned in it, has taxed its subjects to the *whole extent of their ability to pay* ; nor does our splendid orator assert that fact ; and, until that fact is added, taxation is no measure whatever, of what the inhabitants of a nation can pay. I had thought that there was not a clodhopper in the U. States who could not see that the taxation imposed by governments upon their subjects, was no test whatever, of the whole those subjects could pay, until it was conceded that the governments had drawn from them every thing they could pay. Until this be conceded, it is self-evident that taxation affords no rule nor test, nor indication whatever, of the *whole ability* of the people to pay. This fact is not asserted, and, it is devoutly to be hoped, that it has no

existence. That governments, with the exception of the British government, do not draw from their subjects all they can pay, but only so much, as will answer their governmental purposes. To demonstrate the palpable fallacy of our splendid orator upon this point, suppose one of the nations included within the statistical table, France for instance, were to tax French subjects double the amount called for in the statistical table, and the French subjects were to pay the whole amount ; then, according to our orator's measures, and indications, France would be proved to be double as wealthy as she is now represented to be under the table, and her subjects double as able to pay taxes as they now are, after their pockets had been rifled of double the amount that they were before. According to our orator's rule of measuring, or indicating wealth and prosperity,—*the rule of taxation*,—the poor United States have shared a hard but undeserved fate. Now there has been an experiment made upon the ability of the people of the United States, to pay taxes. During the late war, they were greatly augmented—yet they were paid. To do the people of the United States justice, then, the measure of their ability ought to be changed to the amount of their war taxes. The rule of taxation, then, according to the bewildered orator's logic, would prove, that the people of the United States could pay most when they had the least ability to pay ; and that even under the pressure of a most destructive war, they would pay, perhaps, double the amount they could pay in time of profound peace.

The resort to the war taxes would have spared something of the impoverishment and degradation, erroneously thrown upon the people of the United States, by our bewildered orator, in his comparison of them with foreign nations. Here again it will be clearly seen, that all just inferences are completely inverted by our orator. According to his inferences, the more that is drawn from the pockets of the individual, the more is he enabled to pay ; and the amount drawn is, at the same time, the evidence of his prosperity, or his increased capacity to pay. To pursue this course of inference, it must be concluded, that when the last cent is taken from the individual's pocket, then is the acme of his wealth and prosperity ; or, to use the striking metaphor of Mr. Secretary Rush—“That the measure of his prosperity is potentially full.” The statistical table, introduced by our orator, if properly taken, will prove that the inhabitants of the several nations comprehended in it, can pay the amount of taxes drawn from them respectively ; but it neither proves nor indicates that the same inhabitants could not pay more taxes, if more were demanded of them ; and God forbid that all governments should take from the inhabitants respectively, all they can pay. Until this is done, it cannot be told how much the inhabitants of either can pay—The actual taxation, whatever it may be, short of the whole ability to pay, affords no test, nor indication whatever, as to their extreme ability to pay. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely dissatisfied, sir, with this mode of estimating the relative wealth, and prosperity of nations ; because of the despicable, degraded position, assigned the United States, in their connexion with this family of nations. Our

splendid, sonorous aspirant, places the United States—his own country, and ours,—at the tail of the “tag-rag and bobtail,” of nations. For, says our splendid, sublimated orator—“Unfortunate Ireland, disinherited, or rendered in her industry, subservient to England, is exactly in the same state of poverty with Spain, *measured by the rule of taxation, and the United States are still poorer than either!?*” Poor United States!! The poorest of all!! “Still poorer than either!” Really, sir, I think our aspiring orator ought to have been more sure of the correctness of his own statistics, before he could have consented to doom his own country to a degraded state of poverty and wretchedness, even lower than poor unfortunate, disinherited Ireland, or indolent, bigotted, superstitious Spain ; and, consequently, to put her rank, in the family of nations, lower than either. But, sir, I derive great consolation from observing at the same time, that the rule of taxation happens to be no rule at all—for measuring the relative wealth and prosperity of nations ; and that the degraded position assigned by the splendid orator for the United States, is founded in his own misconceptions of his own statistics ; and I am sure, the aspiring orator will himself rejoice at being awakened from his humiliating, delusive dreams, to the reality, that his own country is not the most impoverished and degraded in the world. Here, then, sir, you find that all this grand parade of sonorous statistics, has been introduced as tests of facts, when it turns out to be no test at all. But, sir, this table of statistics is not without its use, admitting it to be true. It does prove, that the people of Great Britain pay more taxes than any other people in the world, and, consequently, are the most oppressed people in the world. I am disposed to think, that the table presents a tolerably correct view of the relative degrees of oppression, of the different governments comprehended in it, allowing for the actual relative wealth of each ; and accordingly you will find, sir, the relative effects of these oppressions upon the condition of the people of the different nations respectively, in their relative numbers of paupers. In this respect, Great Britain indeed is superlatively pre-eminent.

Think not, Mr. Speaker, that these statements and remarks, are made from any prejudice, or any invidious feeling whatever, against the British nation, or people ; very far from it—I indulge no such feelings, sir, towards any nation or people whatever ; and surely, not against the British nation, or people. I esteem the British nation and people, whatever may be the profligacy and oppression of their government, as amongst the most honest, industrious, skilful, independent, high-minded, and gallant in the world. I conceive too, that they have carried the inventions of saving-labor machinery, to a higher pitch than any other people. But the astonishing productions of both their natural, and artificial labor combined, have been found quite incompetent to save them, from the deprecated destruction of governmental oppression. How cautious then, sir, ought we to be, against plunging into a system of policy, which has doomed to vice, misery, wretchedness and pauperism, seventy-nine eightieths of the people of one of the noblest nations upon earth? Sir, there

are three circumstances, accompanying the movements and remarks of our splendid orator, upon this occasion, which I acknowledge, have excited my utmost astonishment.—First ; that in pronouncing his prize speech, our aspiring sublimated orator, should have condescended to have put himself in the hands of a prompter, to play the part of a parrot ; as I believe our orator has done on this occasion. Secondly ; that he should have permitted himself to have been led into such palpable errors, and above all, that he should, without sufficient examination, have indulged himself in ushering forth the same errors to the world, which are, as dishonorable, and degrading to the United States ; as they are obvious and palpable in themselves, whilst he was aspiring to the sublime station of their presidency.—“Unfortunate Ireland, disinherited, or rendered, in her industry, subservient to England, is exactly in the same state of poverty with Spain, *measured by the rule of taxation*—And the United States are still poorer than either.”—Poor United States !!! How deplorable is thy condition !!! How much to be deprecated !!! Doomed to take thy station at the tail of the lowest of the “tag-rag and bobtail” of nations !!!

A few plain, obvious reflections, on the part of our bewildered orator, arising from facts perpetually before his own eyes, might have caused him, at least to doubt, of the justice of placing the United States below every civilized nation in Europe.—The vast proportion of the middling class of society in the United States, and the small proportion of miserable poor, compared with any nation in Europe, particularly with Great Britain, ought to have admonished him against placing the United States, in the most degrading condition in the family of nations. Their exemption from the extremes of wealth and poverty, which characterize all Europe, in a greater or lesser degree, constitutes the great superiority of their condition, if not in relation to wealth, at least in relation to real grandeur, and to every social and political blessing. Accordingly, notwithstanding our bewildered orator’s arithmetical demonstrations, from his statistical table, we find the people fleeing, from all those delusive, European blessings, and practically throwing themselves within the arms of the United States, according to our orator, to participate in their poverty, degradation and wretchedness ; this, particularly, is the case with the people of Great Britain. These reflections alone, ought to have stayed the cruel hand of the bewildered orator, from striking so deadly a blow against his own country : but let the enchanting prize before him ; and the sublimated state of his own mind, plead his excuses, or at least, palliate his errors.

But says our Orator,—page 19.

“But Britain is herself the most striking illustration of the immense power of machinery. Upon what other principle can you account for the enormous wealth which she has accumulated, and which she annually produces ? A statistical writer of that country, several years ago, estimated the total amount of the artificial or machine labor of the nation, to be equal to that of one hundred millions of able bodied laborers. Subsequent estimates of her artificial labor, at the present day, carry it to the enormous height of two hundred millions. But the population of the three kingdoms, is twenty one million five hundred thousand. Supposing that to furnish able-bodied labor to the amount of

four millions, the natural labour will be but two per cent, of the artificial labor. In the production of wealth she operates, therefore, by a power (including the whole population) of two hundred and twenty one millions five hundred thousand; or in other words, by a power eleven times greater than the total of her natural power. If we suppose the machine labor of the United States to be equal to that of ten millions of able-bodied men, the United States will operate, in the creation of wealth, by a power (including all their population) of twenty millions. In the creation of wealth, therefore, the power of Great Britain, compared to that of the United States, is as eleven to one."

May I be permitted then to ask, Mr. Speaker, what then, Mr. Orator? Are these sounding bewildering statistics, in favor of, or against the tariff? I cannot see any necessary affinity, nor connexion between them; and our sublimated orator has flown off without showing any. The obvious purpose of our orator, for introducing these, as well as other similar statistics, is to show the importance, the splendor, and the grandeur of governments. For, he seems to give the merit of all these mighty effects from the invention of labor-saving machinery, to the government; thus to magnify its blessings, and to enamour the people with its power, its splendor, and its grandeur. You cannot but observe, sir, that the whole tenor and spirit of the doctrine, of the fashionable economists, and particularly of the administration, is to produce the conviction, that the government is every thing, and the people nothing. Whereas, the very reverse of this position is true, to wit:—That the people, in their individual characters, are almost every thing, the government very little. The real energies of society exist in the individuals. Legitimate government has very little original, active energy. Government, rightly understood, is a passive, not an active machine. The great object of its institution is to administer justice amongst individuals, and to protect the nation from external violence; after these duties are performed, and provisions of a general nature are made, which individuals cannot make for themselves, the less government has to do with the concerns of society, the better. But let the enquiry be made, in the present case, as to the merit of the invention of the whole labor saving machinery of Great Britain. Is it the merit of the government; or of individuals? Government, I believe, never invented a spinning jenny; nor spun a spool of cotton. The merit, then, is all to individuals; and none to the government. Perhaps, a more illustrative example, could scarcely be furnished, to demonstrate the relative ability, and importance of the people over the government, than the one here presented by our orator. But, notwithstanding all these wonderful productions of individuals, they have been no match for the profligacy of the government. A vast proportion of the people, notwithstanding their almost incredible exertions, are doomed to vice, misery, wretchedness and pauperism: But I ask again, for the arguments, afforded by these statistics, in favor of the tariff. Do they not most eloquently admonish every wise government, to let the people and their occupations alone. Not plunder, and then squander, the whole of the hard earnings of the productive laborer?

Let me now, sir, call your attention to some further statements and remarks, made by our orator, not less extraordinary in some respects,

than those which have just passed in review. In page 15, after giving a statistical account of the exports of the United States, without its having, as far as I am able to judge, any bearing whatever upon the question of the tariff, our bewildered orator remarks: "The distribution of the articles of our exports throughout the United States, cannot fail to fix the attention of the committee. Of the \$47,155,408, to which they amounted last year, three articles alone, (cotton, rice and tobacco,) composed together \$28,549,177. Now, these articles are chiefly produced to the South. And if we estimate that portion of our population who are actually engaged in their culture, it would probably not exceed two millions. Thus, then, less than one fifth of the whole population of the United States produced upwards of one half, nearly two-thirds of the entire value of the exports of the last year." May I be again indulged, sir, in asking, what then, Mr. Orator? are these statements and remarks, for, or against the tariff? Why make them? You have skipped off without giving their moral; or even pointing, to their tendencies. Are they intended to intimate a threat from the physical force of 8,000,000, against 2,000,000? and are you bringing here into practical operation, your doctrine of "the great desideratum of political economy?" Suppose the 2,000,000, do produce and export to the amount of \$28,519,177, and the 8,000,000 do not produce half as much—What then? Is this to be the signal for the 8,000,000 to plunder the 2,000,000? or do the 8,000,000 claim an equal right in the produce of the 2,000,000, with the 2,000,000 themselves? According to your doctrine of the "great desideratum in political economy," that the whole proceeds of the whole productive labor, belong to the whole 10,000,000; to be distributed by the federal government at its own uncontrolled will and caprice? Is it intended here to carry into practical effect the doctrine, that the whole proceeds of the labor of the American people belong to the whole people; in exclusion of the great American principle, that each part of it belongs to the laborer who produced it, subject only to fair, necessary contributions for legitimate governmental objects? If this be not your object, would it not be well to enquire, to whom does the cotton, tobacco and rice belong? and would it not then become a question, whether you have a right to take any part of it from the owners, and give it to those, who own it not? You have not a right to take it for public use, without just compensation. For private use, you have no right to take it at all. If you have, there is an end to the right of private property. Its constitutional security is gone. It is perfectly immaterial by what art of hocus pocus you may do this: if you can do it at all, the right of private property is gone. But it seems not to form any part of the great desideratum of our orator's political economy, to enquire into right, into justice, into morals, into *meum et tuum*; but to seize the whole productive labor of society, and to distribute it regardless of right or wrong, by the fallacious standard of his capricious notions, of the mode in which it can be made to produce "the greatest sum of national wealth." This is the essence of ultra despotism. But, sir, it will not be difficult for the most superficial observer to discover the fallacious and deceptive artifices practised by our orator in making this representation. Admitting it to be true, it is far from containing the

whole truth; very far from containing the most material truths, to enable the mind to comprehend and decide upon the true character of the whole subject. The first important omissions, are the articles of wheat and flour. Why not introduce these articles to share the same fate under the tariff, with cotton, tobacco and rice? They are equally burthened under the tariff, with cotton, tobacco and rice, for the protection of manufactures. Why not introduce their growers then, into the company of the growers of cotton, tobacco and rice? Why exclude them from the threats, thrown out against their associates in interests? There could be but two assignable motives with our orator for the exclusion. As far as I am able to discover, the one was, to give this cunning tariff scheme, a sectional cast, upon which its success mainly depended. Whenever the wheat-growers throughout some of the manufacturing states, New-York, Pennsylvania, Maryland and Delaware, for instance, shall discover their true interests; that notwithstanding their residence in the manufacturing states, their interests are as much affected by the tariff as the growers of cotton, tobacco and rice, they will rise in the majesty of their strength, and crush the unprincipled artifice to atoms. If our orator had included the wheat-growers with their other agricultural associates and sufferers, his insolent threat would lose all its horrors, and of course, its intended effects. Instead of five against one, the majority would have been with the agriculturists; and its *sectional bearing* would also have entirely disappeared.—Hence, the motives for the exclusion of the wheat-growers from his formidable, threatening, statistical statements. Suppose the wheat-growers included, would not that fact alone have varied the whole character and bearing of the terrific statistical representation? as well in relation to its pecuniary results, as to its relative, sectional bearings, and its formidable threatenings? I think, this cannot be denied by any sound, well-organized mind, even in spite of prepossessions and prejudices.

But, sir, this is not the most fallacious bearing and effect of this statement of statistics, under its present aspect. The statement gives only the value of the exports produced from cotton, tobacco, and rice. The imports from cotton, in its manufactured state, and from other foreign manufactured articles, are entirely omitted. The growers of cotton, tobacco and rice, consume imported articles nearly to the amount of the exported. Whilst, therefore, they are credited with the whole amount of their exports, they ought to be debited with the whole amount of their imports; and the balance only carried to their credit as clear profits—whereas, from the aspect of the statistical statement, as it now stands, they are credited with the whole amount of their exports, as clear profits, without any deductions for the imports. With respect to the article of cotton, there is a characteristic of peculiar hardship, provided the constitution is to be at all regarded as the test of principle and right. This constitution prohibits the government from laying any export duty whatever; and of course, no export duty can be laid on cotton.—When, therefore, the cotton grower is placed under the necessity of consuming foreign manufactured cotton fabrics, the high impost duty, upon the importation, will operate upon him precisely as an export duty would do upon the original article; that is, would lessen the

value of the article to the consuming grower, precisely in the same manner as an export duty upon the original article would do. There is another important fact excluded from the statement, which will still further serve to show its fallacious and deceptive aspect:—that is, that a proportion of the proceeds of the exports of cotton, tobacco and rice, is transported from the South to the North, and expended in the purchase of domestic manufactured goods; and, therefore, so much of the proceeds of the exports as are thus expended, should be carried to the credit of the manufacturer, and not to that of the consuming grower of the article. And, at the same time, the manufacturer should never cease to recollect, that he is placed under an obligation to the cotton grower for the *original fabric*;—cotton, which constitutes the great fund for a great portion of *all his industry*. Besides, it should also be recollected, that from the superior density of the population to the North, and other causes, a vast portion more of labor is applied there, to objects of domestic consumption, compared with the objects of production for exportation, than to the South: and, therefore, it is not possible, from any statistical table, to ascertain the relative productiveness of the application of labor to the North and to the South. Certainly not by the extremely deceptive one furnished by our bewildered orator. The whole bearing, therefore, of this part of our orator's statistical statements, so far as it is comprehensible, is demonstrated to be deceptive and fallacious.

You have now in review before you, Mr. Speaker, with as much certainty and accuracy as I can give it, the whole contents of our orator's formidable, sonorous, bombastical, statistical statements: and, after all this grand parade, to what do they amount? Do they present any inducements for abandoning the American system of principle, of competition, and of freedom, for the European one of caprice, of monopoly, and of despotism? On the other hand, sir, do they not furnish the most awful admonitions against this great change of principle? And have I not made good my promise, sir, in demonstrating either that they were too incomprehensible for the brilliant, superficial mind of our orator—that in fact he did not understand them—or, that he has availed himself of their complexity and incomprehensibility, deceptively to practice upon the understandings of others, by withholding from them the most material facts, to enable them to judge correctly?

[About this time, the debate was suspended, for above an hour, in consequence of the roaring of cannon on the Capital Square, in commemoration of the birth day of Washington.]

The House having resumed its session in the afternoon, the Speaker asked, whether I was ready to proceed with the debate? Answering in the affirmative, I rose and proceeded to remark—I cannot help disclosing to the house, that the state of my feelings becomes more embarrassed, as I progress in the discussion of this question, from the recollection of the great portion of time I have already occupied, as well as from the anticipation of the portion of it, which will still be necessary to enable me to present the whole of my views of the whole subject. But, sir, permit me to assure you, that the subject has lost nothing of its magnitude, nor interest, from examination, and consideration. No, sir, so far from it, I become more impressed with its

importance, upon every step I advance in its discussion. Still impelled then, sir, by the invigorating impulse which induced me to introduce the subject, I proceed with its thorough developement; and, sir, I have now arrived at a point, in this perplexed, and complicated speech, which has something more of affinity, and connexion with the doctrines of the tariff; than could be found in the remote, expansive field of our brilliant orator's sonorous statistics. Indulge me too, sir, with observing here, that although, as I think, the misconceptions, miscalculations, and want of comprehension, on the part of our bewildered orator, have before been demonstrably made to appear, in relation to the whole of his statistics, his deceptive promises, preposterous absurdities, and palpable contradictions, embraced in the present quotation, will be rendered still more evident. They will be found too, to relate to the git of the question. They present the splendid orator's views of the whole promised protection of agriculture; pretended to be one main object of this tariff scheme--his political panacea, for curing all the ills of all the occupations in society. That our brilliant Orator may have the full benefit of the whole of his views, and promises to the agriculturists, I will present the whole in one compact form. Here permit me to protest, sir, against an imputation, often brought against me; that I have heretofore misrepresented gentlemen, in the public prints. So far from it, I have ever made it an invariable rule, where reference could be had to written documents, to quote them, in the author's own words; so that, in every instance, he shall tell his own tale upon himself; and I have, at all times, taken this course, from the fear of doing, by possibility, unintentional injustice to the object of my commentaries. I am induced, by the same fear of possibly doing unintentional injustice to our brilliant orator, by my recital, to quote his speech in a connected form in its own words, in reference to each point, to which it applies—

Extract from Speech—Page 14.

“What sort of a figure would a member of the British Parliament have made; what sort of a reception would his opposition have obtained, if he had remonstrated against the passage of the Corn Law, by which British consumption is limited to the bread-stuffs of British production, to the entire exclusion of American, and stated that America could not and would not buy British manufactures, if Britain did not buy American flour?”

Again—page 16.

“Our agricultural is our greatest interest. It ought ever to be predominant. All others should bend to it. And in considering what is for its advantage, we should contemplate it in all its varieties, of planting, farming, and grazing. Can we do nothing to invigorate it; nothing to correct the errors of the past, and to brighten the still more unpromising prospects which lie before us?”

Extract—page 18.

“ But this home market, highly desirable as it is, can only be created and cherished by the PROTECTION of our own legislation against the inevitable prostration of our industry, which must ensue from the action of FOREIGN policy and legislation. The effect and the value of this domestic care of our own interests will be obvious from a few facts and considerations. Let us suppose that half a million of persons are now employed abroad in fabricating for our consumption, those articles, of which by the operation of this bill a supply is intended to be provided within ourselves. That half a million of persons are, in effect, subsisted by us; but their actual means of subsistence are drawn from foreign agriculture. If we could transport them to this country, and incorporate them in the mass of our own population, there would instantly arise a demand for an amount of provisions equal to that which would be requisite for their subsistence throughout the whole year. That demand, in the article of flour alone, would not be less than the quantity of about 900,000 barrels, besides a proportionate quantity of beef and pork, and other articles of subsistence. But nine hundred thousand barrels of flour exceeded the entire quantity exported last year, by nearly one hundred and fifty thousand barrels. What activity would not this give, what cheerfulness would it not communicate, to our now dispirited farming interest! But if, instead of these 500,000 artisans emigrating from abroad, we give by this bill, employment to an equal number of our own citizens now engaged in unprofitable agriculture, or idle, from the want of business, the beneficial effect upon the productions of our farming labour would be nearly doubled. The quantity would be diminished by a subtraction of the produce from the labour of all those who should be diverted from its pursuits to manufacturing industry, and the value of the residue would be enhanced, both by that diminution and the creation of the home market to the extent supposed. And the honorable gentleman from Virginia, may repress any apprehensions which he entertains, that the plough will be abandoned, and our fields remain unsown. For, under all the modifications of social industry, if you will secure to it a just reward, the greater attractions of agriculture will give to it that proud superiority which it has always maintained.”

Again—page 22.

“ The agricultural portion of it is said by the gentleman from Virginia, to be greater than that created by any other branch of her industry. But that flows mainly from a policy similar to that proposed by this bill.”

Again—page 39.

“The best security against the demoralization of society, is the constant and profitable employment of its members. The greatest danger to public liberty is from idleness and vice. If manufactures form cities, so does commerce. And the disorders and violence which proceed from the contagion of the passions, are as frequent in one description of those communities as in the other. There is no doubt but that the yeomanry of a country is the safest depository of public liberty. In all time to come, and under any probable direction of the labour of our population, the agricultural class must be much the most numerous and powerful, and will ever retain, as it ought to retain, a preponderating influence in our councils. The extent and the fertility of our lands constitute an adequate security against an excess in manufactures, and also against oppression on the part of capitalists towards the labouring portions of the community.”

Mr. Speaker, attentively review these quotations, sir, and ask yourself if they do not furnish the most reluctant reflections; that when the human mind, once becomes enamoured of an object, dazzled with a prize, it is rendered incapable of doing itself justice by the proper, and unbiassed exercise of its own faculties. Our sublimated orator, dazzled with the prize of the presidential chair, was speaking to please every body: All things, to all men; but the great object of his speech, would seem to have been, to bribe the voters of the manufacturing states, and to risk his chance with the agricultural states, upon expressions of affectionate wishes, and sympathetic interests. Hence his delusive language to the agriculturists, whilst he is actually plundering them, to make up his bribe to the manufacturers. His *protection* to the manufacturers, is made to consist of the *money of others*; whilst *no money* of any body's, is given to the agriculturist for *his protection*. In lieu of it, he is paid off with fairy tales, and delusive promises. Let me beg your attention then, sir, to this highly interesting branch of the subject. Let us coolly, and calmly make the enquiry, what the agriculturist actually pays, what he gets, and what he is promised, by our orator? First, then, as to our aspiring orator's promises to the agriculturists. In page 21, our orator says: “The agricultural portion of it (the productions of labor,) is said, by the gentleman from Virginia, to be greater than that created by any other branch of her (British) industry; *but that flows mainly from a policy similar to that proposed in this bill.*” Here our aspiring orator asserts; that the great productions of agriculture in Great Britain, have accrued in that country, “from a policy similar to that proposed in this bill.” It is of course concluded, that the agriculture of this country, is intended by the tariff bill, to be put upon at least as good a footing, as British agriculture is, by their tariff laws. This assurance is made doubly sure, by an express declaration of the splendid orator: For, although he declares

expressly, and I believe repeatedly; that he had no intention of recommending the British system of policy for imitation, and adoption here; that he was no eulogist of England; in page 36, he says—"Let our arts breathe under the shades of protection—*let them be protected as in England*, and we shall then be ready, as England is now said to be, to put aside protection, and to enter upon the freest exchanges. To what other cause than to their *whole prohibitory policy*, can you ascribe *British prosperity*?" Here our orator expressly ascribes the prosperity of England to the *whole of her prohibitory policy*. The protection of her agriculture is the foundation of the whole, and is carried to a greater, and a more efficient extent, than any other. Here, *this whole prohibitory policy*, is expressly recommended for imitation; and it was but reasonable to expect; that American agriculture would be let in for its full share of protection by the tariff bill. Let us now see how this imitative policy is carried into effect, in relation to American agriculture? The protection in Great Britain, is founded, in what is called their corn laws; and which are triumphantly referred to by our orator in page 14.

"What sort of a figure would a member of the British Parliament have made? What sort of reception would his proposition have attained, if he had remonstrated against the corn law;" and in page 16, our orator most kindly observes; "our agriculture is our greatest interest. It ought ever to be predominant. All others should bend to it; and in considering what is for its advantage, we ought to contemplate it in all its various branches of planting, farming, and grazing. Can we do nothing to invigorate it?" In page 18, our orator observes; "For under all the modifications of social industry, if you will secure to it its just reward, the greater attractions of agriculture will give to it that proud superiority which it has always maintained." In page 39, "There is no doubt but that the yeomanry of a country is the safest depository of public liberty. In all time to come, and under any probable direction of the labor of our population, the agricultural class must be much the most numerous and powerful, and will ever retain, as it ought to retain, a preponderating influence in our public councils." Mr. Speaker, after all these plaudits, and promises, did you not expect that something would be done for the protection of agriculture? That one main object of the tariff, was to put it, in relation to other occupations, upon at least, as good a footing as British agriculture, in relation to the other occupations of that country? Let us now see, sir, how these gilded, deceptive promises, have been carried into effect, by the tariff bill. This, sir, is the main point of enquiry; and I therefore beg your most particular attention to it—I most earnestly entreat the best attention of the whole agricultural class, but most particularly of the wheat-growers, to this enquiry. Its results will be rendered too plain, not to be understood, by every attentive mind. What then are the corn-laws of Great Britain, which afford protection to the agriculturists, there? What is the tariff here, which was avowed to be intended, to correspond with the British corn laws there? Let us critically examine this imitative policy, between Great Britain and the United

States. The corn laws of Great Britain absolutely prohibit the importation of foreign corn, until the price of wheat shall amount to 80 shillings sterling, a quarter, of eight bushels; or eight shillings sterling per bushel. The tariff law imposes a duty of 25 cents upon the importation of foreign wheat. So begins, and so ends, the protection to the wheat growers! What are the relative local circumstances in regard to bread stuffs between Great Britain, and the United States, upon which, this imitative policy is founded? Great Britain is an importer of bread stuffs, to a great amount every year. A prohibition, therefore, upon the importation of foreign grain, leaves the agriculture of Great Britain to its own rivalship. It excludes all foreign competition. Not growing bread stuffs enough, for home consumption, a good price for grain is thus always insured to the agriculturists; and the other classes of society are compelled to pay the monopoly price, which is generally double the price of the article in foreign countries. Under the tyranny of the corn laws, all other classes pay double as much for their bread, as they could purchase it for, from foreign countries, but for this tyrannical prohibition. In Great Britain then, the corn laws are found to be so operative, as to ensure an enormous bounty to the corn growers, and *is the foundation of the whole monopolizing; or restrictive system.* The United States are an exporting country of bread stuff of all kinds, but particularly of wheat. No foreign country, therefore, can compete with us in that article, in our own markets. Yet, as a protection to American wheat-growers, a duty of 25 cents is laid upon the importation of foreign wheat—that is the whole protection under our aspiring orator's, flattering, gilded promises. That provision is perfectly inoperative, and of course, the promised protection, nominal. No foreign wheat is ever imported into the United States, and of course, no duty is ever paid. This was precisely the case before the passage of the tariff; and it now is. In the ordinary condition of the country, therefore, the tariff protection of agriculture, is merely nominal, and inoperative. There is but one condition of the country, in which, it could be operative. That would happen, only in case of scarcity; in which case, the wheat-grower, would be more burthened with the impost upon wheat, than any other class in society. In the event of a scarcity, the farmer would require more imported grain—relatively than any other class of the community for his seed, and for his consumption, in consequence of his greater number of hands, and beasts of labor; and the farmer of course, would have more of the 25 cents duty to pay, than persons of any other occupations.

Of what then does the *protection of agriculture consist?* In the ordinary condition of the country, it consists of nothing. In the extraordinary case of scarcity, which in all human probability never will happen, it consists of a duty, mainly upon the agriculturist himself. Of what does the *protection of manufactories consist* under the Tariff? *What is this protection made of?* It consists of other people's money. *It is made of other people's money.* The protection of agriculture, then consists of burthens upon agriculture. The protection of manufactories consists, mainly of burthens upon agriculture—

high intolerable burthens upon agriculture. Is this reciprocity? Is it justice? Is it not the most intolerable injustice? Can it be borne? Ought it to be borne? In regard to its imitative character with British policy, it would be quite laughable, were it not for its mischievous, and destructive effects upon agriculture—The best interests of the country. By the *British protection*, the *British agriculturists are now receiving from the other classes of society, double prices for bread-stuffs*, beyond the prices of prohibited foreign bread-stuffs; whilst the *American agriculturists receive nothing*; and pay double prices to the manufacturer for every article of consumption—even for the implements of husbandry, which are used to raise the bread for the manufacturer. Here then, is a policy, professed to be imitative of British policy, recommended for the adoption of the United States; in a case, in which, the condition of the two countries, stands, not only without resemblance; but in direct contrast, with each other—what then, can be expected; but contrasted, instead of imitative, results!!!—As far as my knowledge extends, agriculture, in no civilized country under the sun, is placed by government in such a state of oppression, and degradation, and deterioration, as that of the United States. Done, too, by the tariff regulations! Whilst they promise every thing for the protection of agriculture! I have sometimes reluctantly been led to the conclusion; that there must have been some unaccountable carelessness, and inattention in the organization of the Tariff bill; otherwise, it could not be possible, that a majority of Congress could have placed agriculture in such a plundered and degraded condition; and the ridiculous attempt to gull, and appease the wheat-growers with 25 cents upon the importation of foreign wheat, whilst it affords him no beneficial relief whatever, is an inexcusable insult to his understanding. I beg, I entreat, the earnest, and unbiassed attention of the wheat-growers particularly, to these plain demonstrations. But it is often asked, what harm has the Tariff done? Is not this a most extraordinary question? Look at its effects in the depression of the prices of agricultural productions, and the consequent depression in the prices of lands from the Potomac to the Gulf of Mexico; indeed, throughout the whole agricultural country of the United States? Look at the impoverished, sinking farmers? Ask the farmer—let every farmer ask himself—whether under the operations of this Tariff, he receives for the productions of his labor a cent more than the labor of producing them actually costs him? Ask whether the annual productions of his farm actually defray its annual expenditures? If he should indulge in imported articles, either foreign or domestic? whether he is not compelled to apply a portion of his capital to pay the current expenditures of the year? I know it is my own case, and I believe it is with most of my neighbors. This state of things cannot last long. Bankruptcy must be the consequence. Agriculture could not stand the burthens, if it would. No, sir! With the best possible disposition to support the Tariff, agriculture could not do it—It would inevitably sink under the effort. The burthen is intolerable.

But, Mr. Speaker, with all our flattering orator's deceptive promises to the agriculturist, he seems himself to *intend* to impose upon him the most intolerable burthens; at the very moment he is promising him a just reward for his industry. For, says our Orator,—“But, if instead of these 500,000 artizans emigrating from abroad, “we” give, by this bill, employment to an equal number of our own citizens, now engaged in unprofitable agriculture, or idle from the want of business, the beneficial effect upon our farming interest would be nearly doubled.” What are the *means* pointed out, in the bill, by the sagacious orator, for converting 500,000 farmers into as many manufacturers? The only *means* consist of *burthens*, so heavy upon the agriculturist, that he will be willing to escape from his own chosen calling, without the benefit of apprenticeship—no politechinc schools having been provided by the bill, to participate in the protection of the favored manufacturing class. And, in this way, the sagacious orator proposes to give to agriculture; “that proud superiority which it has always maintained.” Can there be more preposterous absurdities than these? In almost a single aspiration, our bewildered orator, speaks of our now dispirited farming interest; of unprofitable agriculture; and of agriculture, always maintaining a proud superiority—promised to be bottomed upon a just reward to social industry. But this proud superiority, is to be obtained by giving to agriculture its just reward, with all the rest of social industry; whilst this *just reward*, is to consist of such *heavy impositions* upon agriculture, as to drive 500,000 of its class, into the manufacturing class, to participate with them in the *protection* afforded by the bill; and which constitutes, the very just reward to the agriculturist. Can there be collected together, more ridiculous absurdities, more incoherent conceptions, and more palpable contradictions, than are huddled up together, in the foregoing quotations? But there is one expression in the group, which stands pre-eminently distinguished; and serves to demonstrate, more than any other, the sublimated, intoxicated state, of our aspiring orator's enchanted mind.

But, says the orator; as if “Jove in his chair of the sky Lord Mayor.” “If ‘we’ give by this bill, employment to an equal number of citizens.” Had the buoyant orator ever thought or inquired what employment “we” have to give? Suppose “we” have no employment to give by this bill, or in any other way; what then will become of his brilliant promises? I presume, that our enchanted orator has found out by this time, that “we” have no employment to give. Governments have no employment to give. What employments can they have to give? They may *vary occupations* by tyrannical measures, always believed to be for the worse, but they can *create none*. Our orator, however, seems to think, that, “we” can do every thing. Jehovah's lords on earth,—or, at least, God's vicegerents on earth.—“We” have the whole world in a sling; and although, according to our great prototype, good-for-nothing fellows, “we” are ruling and fixing the destinies of the world; *for purposes of beneficence, for bettering the condition of the people*; our standard, our own unlimited pleasure, or caprice. Prolific invention!—Filling the world with experimental schemes, with despotic restrictions upon the liberties of the people—varying their

occupations, and the distributions of their labor. Listen now, sir, to some of the delusive misconceptions and miscalculations of our bewildered orator, which although then standing on conjecture, are now reduced to experience. Our buoyant orator triumphantly asks in page 14—"What sort of a figure would a member of the British parliament have made; what sort of a reception would his opposition have obtained, if he had remonstrated against the passage of the corn law, by which British consumption is limited to the bread-stuffs of British production, to the entire exclusion of American?" Might not this question, "now," with much more propriety, be reverberated, upon our short-sighted orator? What sort of a figure, would a member of the British Parliament "now" make; if "now" he did not remonstrate, against the corn laws? What sort of a figure, does our buoyant, deluded orator, himself, "now" make; after having placed the policy of his tariff scheme, upon the whole policy of the British restrictive system, and particularly upon the corn laws, as its main pillar, when the policy of the whole system has been denounced, by the British ministry, and, as far as practicable, abandoned? No man, I presume, ever was silly enough, however, to suppose, that upon the moment of the discovery of the mischievous tendency of measures, which were transfused through all the ramifications of society, a competent remedy could be instantly applied, and the evil instantly corrected. No, sir, corrections of these complicated evils are not to be easily, and instantly effected; and the difficulties in providing the corrections, ought most strongly to admonish us against their original adoption. But with our enchanted, infatuated tariff-schemers, every consideration which ought to have insured delay, caution and circumspection, was urged in favor of precipitation. Let me, sir, again entreat you to behold the contrast between the British corn laws, as affording protection to British agriculture, and the American tariff laws, as affording protection to American agriculture. The British corn laws, in effect, give a bounty upon bread-stuffs of double its actual price, on a fair principle of general competition. The American tariff gives no effective bounty or reward whatever. Is that all? Oh no. The American tariff makes the grower of bread-stuffs pay, perhaps, double price, upon almost all imported articles which are necessary for the consumption of agriculture, not excepting the very implements of husbandry themselves, employed in making bread for the subsistence of the manufacturers. Hence, whilst the British shoemaker, pays the British agriculturist, double price; and receives, only the lowest price of labor for his shoes; the American agriculturist, pays the American shoemaker, double price for his shoes; and receives nothing, from the shoemaker, but, the most depressed price for his bread.—The case equally applies, to every article required for the consumption of the American agriculturist.—Behold the contrast, in the practical operations of this pretended imitative policy!!! It is impossible, however, not to yield to a necessity which strikes at the very salvation of the nation. In Great Britain, under this unjust, cruel, tyrannical system, the manufacturers are compelled to give to the British grower for all his bread-stuffs, double the price he could get them for from foreign countries. The British manufacturer, therefore, subsists himself at double the cost of his

foreign competitors ; of course, he must ultimately sink, in all foreign markets, and necessarily become stripped of employment at home. But, sir, our orator denies that the British government has in fact abandoned the restrictive system. He asserts, that her restrictive system continues to a great extent. This is readily admitted. I never heard the contrary asserted—But the fact, I assert, is, that the British ministry have denounced the whole doctrines of the restrictive system, and that the denunciation has been made from the thorough conviction, that they are radically wrong in theory, and infinitely mischievous in practice : that they have denounced the principle of the corn laws, and called for their repeal or modification. Do you believe, sir, that the British landholders would tolerate such an unjust, unequal, and wicked burthen, as that imposed upon agriculture by the American tariff for one moment? No, sir, such a measure *there*, would not be tolerated for one instant, and it is wonderful to me, that it should have been tolerated here for three whole years ; whilst its effects have been, using a figurative expression, to grind the agriculturists into dust and ashes—Our buoyant orator, still upon his high ropes, his power omnipotent, observes, page 18th. “ Let us suppose that half a million of persons (quite moderate—down to half millions, instead of whole millions and hundreds of millions) are now employed abroad, in fabricating for our consumption, those articles of which, by the operation of this bill, a supply is intended to be provided for ourselves. That half a million of persons are in effect, subsisted by us, and their actual means of subsistence are drawn from foreign agriculture. If we could transport them to this country, and incorporate them in the mass of our own population, there would instantly arise a demand for an amount of provision equal to that which would be requisite for their subsistence throughout the whole year.” Here, our sagacious orator resorts to a common artifice in argument—putting suppositious cases. The suppositious cases are generally grounded upon impossibilities, as is the present cunning device of our orator. Suppose, says he, a half million of persons employed abroad should be brought to this country. To which supposition I reply by putting another—Suppose they were not. In the event of my supposition being founded in fact, the whole argument, founded upon his fictitious case, would, instantly become idle and unavailing. It happens in this case, that our orator’s supposition did not only not happen, but could not happen. It is beyond the powers of government to transport a half million of persons from one country to another, situated three thousand miles apart, in any short time, and without great expense. Our orator’s supposition is not only fallacious, but impossible in itself. My supposition is true. His great error therefore consists in this :—He is providing a remedy for a suppositious case which never can happen, instead of applying his remedy to a case in actual existence. But, says our buoyant orator: “ If “we” could transport them to this country.” But what is to be done, and why was the subject introduced ; if “we” cannot transport them to this country? Now, I assert, that “we”—our omnipotent rulers—cannot transport them to this country ; consequently, this “if” is perfectly inoperative, and

the consequences which have been deduced from it, false and unfounded. Our orator, in the plenitude of governmental power, asserts, in page 15: "One third only of her population (G. Britain) engaged in agriculture; the other two-thirds furnishing a market for the produce of that third. Withdraw this market, and what becomes of her agriculture?" Permit me to tell you, Mr. Orator, that the government of G. Britain, with its omnipotence, united with all its wealth and physical force, cannot withdraw this market. It is essentially incorporated with society, and cannot be withdrawn by the whole power of the most powerful government on earth. Mr. Speaker, upon reviewing this part of the subject, are you not surprised, sir, at the numerous errors of our orator, both in regard to facts and doctrines? Have they not greatly exceeded your expectations both in point of numbers and demonstrations? and sir, is it not a subject of the most profound regret, that our fundamental institutions should be crumbled into dust—our union hazarded—our people set together by the ears; different sections of the country put to war against each other, by the misconceptions and miscalculations of aspiring, thoughtless, superficial, political empyrics? Permit me now, sir, to call your most serious attention, to another prominent quotation from our orator.

Extract—pages 24, 25.

"And what is this tariff? It seems to have been regarded as a sort of monster, huge and deformed—a wild beast, endowed with tremendous powers of destruction, about to be let loose among our people—if not to devour them, at least to consume their substance. But let us calm our passions, and deliberately survey this alarming, this terrific being. The sole object of the tariff is to tax the produce of foreign industry, with the view of promoting American industry. The tax is exclusively levelled at foreign industry. That is the avowed and direct purpose of the tariff. If it subjects any part of American industry to burthens, that is an effect not intended, but is altogether incidental, and perfectly voluntary. It has been treated as an imposition of burthens upon one part of the community by design, for the benefit of another; as if, in fact, money were taken from the pockets of one portion of the people and put into the pockets of another. But, is this a fair representation of it? No man pays the duty assessed on the foreign article by compulsion, but voluntarily; and this voluntary duty, if paid, goes into the common exchequer, for the common benefit of all. Consumption has four objects of choice: 1. It may abstain from the use of foreign articles, and thus avoid the payment of the tax. 2. It may employ the rival American fabric. 3. It may engage in the business of manufacturing, which this bill is designed to foster. 4. Or it may supply itself from household manufactures."

Here our orator tauntingly inquires, "and what is a tariff?" He then answers: "It seems to have been regarded as a sort of monster, huge and deformed—a wild beast, endowed with tremendous powers of destruction, about to be let loose amongst our people—if not to devour them, at least, to consume their substance." A most excellent description of the tariff in question—a better figurative one could scarcely be given—I, surely, cannot attempt to better it. That it will produce,

and as far as the experiment has gone, has produced, precisely the effects upon the agricultural part of the community, described by our glowing orator, I think, cannot be denied; and, if I should not be very much mistaken, amidst its destructive influence upon the substance of the agriculturists, our aspiring orator will himself become one of its surest victims. I am perfectly satisfied, that he must, himself, ultimately, be devoured by this huge monster of his own creation. Now, sir, let us see our consolation, for the introduction of this destructive monster amongst us. Our deluded orator says:—"The sole object of the tariff is to tax the produce of foreign industry, with a view of promoting American industry"—no doubt, thought a very cunning contrivance by its author;—but he is entirely mistaken in the intended effect; his sole object is utterly mistaken. *It is a tax*, and a most onerous and unjust tax, upon *American industry*, and not upon *foreign industry*, the mistaken object of it. Who pays the tax? Is it paid by foreigners? Certainly not. Do not Americans pay it? Do not we, here present, pay our full proportion of it?—If so, the sole object of the tax is utterly mistaken; it is a tax, *in effect*, whatever be its object, upon American, not foreign, industry, whatever may have been the kind intention of its author. But now comes our consolation. Our deluded orator consoles us, by carelessly and tauntingly informing us—"If it subjects any part of *American industry* to burthens, it is an effect not intended, and is altogether incidental and perfectly voluntary." Indeed, Mr. Orator, are you so kind as not to intend the mischief? But here we have the consolation, that if *our industry should be subject to burthens, the effect was not intended*; it would, of course, be done through ignorance, not design; and, therefore, ought to be borne without a murmur.—Of what practical benefit is it to the sufferer, that his sufferings have been produced by ignorance, and not design? Now, it turns out upon experiment, that American industry is extremely burthened, though by ignorance, not by design, in direct contradiction of the sole, avowed object of the bill; and as the tariff, in that most important respect, has entirely missed its own original aim, it surely ought to be abandoned, according to the avowed declarations and doctrines of our miscalculating adventurous orator.—But, wonderful to be told! our dashing orator observes, "It has been treated as an imposition of burthens upon one part of the community, by design, for the benefit of the other; as if, in fact, money were taken from the pockets of one portion of the people, and put into the pockets of another. But is that a fair representation of it?" Most certainly it is—as fair, as plain, as simple, as can possibly be made. I ask you, in turn, Mr. Orator, is not that the fact? Is not that a fair representation of the case? Have you the hardihood to deny that fact? I should suppose it to be impossible. Who has more frequently asserted, and proved the fact, than our interrogating orator? What is the burthen of his song, from the frontispiece, to the conclusion of his speech? Does he not vauntingly tell us—Protection to manufactures? Protection to a great amount, and the word "**PROTECTION**" written in Roman characters, to enhance the influence of the word upon superficial observers? Of what does this protection consist? I presume the deluded orator would not answer—of nothing. It consists, then, of something.—What, then, is that something? Is it not money? If so,

whose money? Not the manufacturer's money.—The manufacturer would not thank you, for a protection made out of his own money. This protection then, is made out of other people's money.—The bewildered orator tells you, mainly out of the money of the growers of cotton, tobacco, and rice—he ought to have added the growers of wheat.—Nor is any class of society exempted, but the manufacturers themselves.—They are the receivers, not the payers of this vast protection—Now Mr. Speaker, let me ask you, sir, if there be not something here, more than a want of candor? a want of sincerity? Is there not something like hardihood in this question, and answer, of our bewildered orator? After he had, from the beginning of his speech, to the end of it, magnified the value, and importance of this protection to the manufacturer, and proved that it was paid by others; but, mainly, by the growers of cotton, tobacco and rice, for him to put this question, and back it by this supposititious denial, is really unexpected and unaccountable. “As if, in fact, money were taken from the pockets of one portion of the people, and put into the pockets of another.”—Is not this the most extraordinary supposititious denial of a fact, which he had himself asserted, and proved, over and over again? But our puzzled orator, does not deny the fact, absolutely. It is done, by his own peculiar logic—by his assertion of a collateral fact. By his common artifice of shifting a question. Instead of an absolute denial that the tariff does take the money out of one man's pocket and put it into another, our orator says—“No man pays the duty assessed on the foreign articles, by compulsion, but voluntarily.” Here is another subterfuge, as uncandid, and disingenuous, as the last. The payment is not voluntary, and it is scarcely possible to suppose, that our orator did not know that it was not voluntary.—Physical compulsion, it is true, is not applied for the enforcement of the law. But a penalty, growing out of the nature of the law, is applied to its enforcement, upon the ordinary principle of penalties. No physical compulsion is applied by law to prevent one man from murdering another—but the penalty of the murder is death. The law leaves it perfectly voluntary with every man to murder his fellow—provided he will incur the penalty. But, says the law, if you do commit murder, you shall die. So, says the tariff, if you purchase imported articles, although of the first necessity, you shall pay double price for them. Let me illustrate this position, by reference to one case, taken from the British, and one from the American tariff laws. The British tariff laws prohibit the importation of foreign bread stuffs; till the price amounts to an enormous sum; and leaves it perfectly voluntary with the British subject, to purchase British bread stuffs, or not. Suppose the British subject should avail himself of this volition, he must necessarily starve.—The penalty is unavoidable, upon exercising the volition.—Surely sufficient, to give the character of coercion, to the law. The like consequence would attend the American citizen under the American tariff law, who should refuse to purchase domestic shoes—(British shoes being excluded.) In the exercise of his volition, he must go without shoes;—frost-bitten feet, or worse, would be the unavoidable penalty.—Surely sufficient to enforce the purchase of domestic shoes; and to strip the citizen of all volition under the law.—But our orator has pointed out four ways of

avoiding the penalty. For, says he, "consumption has four objects of choice. 1st. It may abstain from the use of foreign articles, and thus avoid the payment of the tax." No! consumption has no choice. It is placed under a necessity to use foreign articles. But if the article be bought, the tax must be paid; or the penalty, consisting of the tax incurred, and the compulsion imposed upon consumption is, that it must have foreign articles. "Secondly—It may employ the rival American fabric." But then the penalty, equal to the duty on the foreign article, must be paid to the American manufacturer for his protection, amounting in most cases, to double the actual value of the article: The very penalty, the very evil, and the very injustice complained of!—"Third—It may engage in the business of manufacturing, which this bill is intended to foster." May it, Mr. Orator? How kind is that consolation! It is admitted, that in this way it may escape the penalty. But it will be admitted, I presume, that this mode of escaping the penalty, is partial.—All cannot avail themselves of this mode of escape. Mr. Orator heretofore seemed to think, if he could drive 500,000 farmers from agriculture to manufacturing, it would be enough. Now, all are to find refuge under the protected manufacturer's wing, against the unjust and intolerable impositions upon others. What nonsense!! What mischief!! Fourth—"Or it may supply itself from the household manufactures." A sufficient reply to this suggestion is, that all cannot supply themselves from household manufactures, if they would. Even if they could, there are not materials in the southern country sufficient to enable the people to do so. But, sir, one material part of the consolation, offered by our mistaken orator, is not yet noticed. If the agriculturist should, from ignorance, be made to pay the tax, it should be a consolation to him to know, that it "goes into the common exchequer for the common benefit of all." Some alleviation, to be sure, if there were any security against its being expended in profligate schemes of disbursement, and for gratifications to unprincipled parasites and favorites; but where is the consolation in cases of paying the bounty, equal to the duty, to the manufactures upon the purchase of domestic articles? There is no consolation held out in the soothing balm of our deluded orator in those cases. The money in those cases goes not into the common exchequer, but into the manufacturer's pocket. The only consolation, then, must consist, of the knowledge of the unprincipled plunder, of the insupportable injustice of such discrimination between the different classes of society. But, Mr. Speaker, according to our orator's own avowal, that no tax was intended upon American industry, since the most enormous tax has actually occurred, have not the injured a right to demand an abandonment of the injurious measure, so soon as the mischievous mistake is discovered; and is not our orator bound by every principle of honor, and honesty, to use his best efforts for that purpose? And can a doubt exist of the destructive effects of the tariff? Look at the price of lands, and their products throughout the whole farming country; but particularly, from the Potomac, to the Gulf of Mexico. Look at the impoverished farmer, behold his gloom, and despondency, and hear his tale of his pecuniary distresses; and it is not possible that a doubt should exist, as to its most extensive destruction, over a most extended country, whilst our atten-

tion is dazzled, by holding up to it, the extreme wealth and splendor of a few manufacturing districts,—an effect not at all to be wondered at, when the vast amount drawn from an extensive impoverished country, is expended in these comparatively limited districts. But these facts prove, rather than disprove, the extreme injurious effects of the tariff upon the great mass of society. The partial benefit to a few overgrown rich stockholders, cannot compensate the injuries to the great mass of society. Let me now, Mr. Speaker, call your most serious attention to another quotation from our bewildered orator, which may incidentally serve further to illustrate this important part of the subject.

Extract—page 35.

“The relaxation from the colonial policy, in the instance of our trade and navigation with the West Indies, is a most unfortunate example for the honorable gentleman; for it is an illustrious proof of the success of our restrictive policy, when resolutely adhered to.—“Great Britain had prescribed the terms on which we were to be graciously allowed to carry on that trade. The effect of her regulations was to exclude our navigation altogether, and a complete monopoly on the part of the British navigation, was secured. We forbade it, unless our vessels should be allowed a perfect reciprocity. Great Britain stood out a long time, but finally yielded; our navigation now fairly shares with hers in the trade.”

Mr. Speaker, the contents of this quotation, are of no ordinary interest. They ought to attract the attention of every intelligent American citizen. They ought to be well understood by all. Our sublimated, gasconading orator, seems here to have placed himself in a most awkward, and unfortunate dilemma. He had before spoken in the same taunting manner, of the British corn laws. He exhibited them as the solid and durable foundation and bulwark of the landed British restrictive system; and almost before the breath which poured forth their eulogies, and predicted their duration, had stayed its enchanting sounds, the abandonment of these laws is called for by the British ministry, and nation; and that too, upon the grounds of their intolerably destructive effects upon the British population. The principle itself had, by woeful experiment, been demonstrated to have been originally, radically wrong, and with it, the whole doctrine of the British restrictive system. There again, our orator, in his best gasconading manner, observes—“We forbade it, unless our vessels should be allowed a perfect reciprocity. Great Britain stood out a long time, but finally yielded, and our navigation “now” fairly shares with hers in the trade.”—“Now”, was then, March, 1824. “Now,” is February, 1827. May not this question, “now,” be triumphantly reverberated upon our deluded, gasconading orator? Does our navigation fairly share with her “now?” Who stands out longest, “now,” February, 1827? Great Britain, or our gasconading orator?—“Now,” Great Britain has withdrawn this reciprocity, and excluded the United States from the trade altogether. But, says our gasconading orator, “The relaxation of the colonial policy in the instance of our trade and navigation with the West Indies, is a most unfortunate example for the honorable gentleman.” “For it is an illustrious proof of the success of our restrictive policy, when resolutely adhered to.” Does the present condi-

tion of our trade with the West Indies "now," afford this illustrious example of the success of our restrictive system, when resolutely adhered to? What is "now" the condition of that trade? A total exclusion of the United States from that trade; whilst European nations are invited to a participation in it. Is it possible!! How came this sad reverse? Where was the prophetic spirit of our scheming orator? Did the United States fail resolutely to adhere to the restrictive policy? or was this exclusion produced by a most resolute adherence to the same restrictive policy? It seems to have been produced by neither one course nor the other—but by the gross mismanagement of our bewildered orator, in not resolutely adhering to either. No intelligent, reflecting man can doubt but that the loss of the West India trade has arisen from the tariff; nor can he fail to foresee an entire loss of the whole British trade, from the same cause, and possibly the gain of a British war. The British policy, since the passage of the tariff bill, has been as wise, as liberal, and as consistent, as that of the United States has been weak, selfish and fluctuating—until her determination upon her present retaliatory system.—The British doubtless foresaw, that if the tariff should be persevered in, retaliation would be the inevitable consequence.

Yet, it being a mere municipal regulation, she had no right to make a formal objection to it; but she determined, in lieu of remonstrance, to try the effect of a liberal policy towards the United States. In this liberal spirit, she relaxed her colonial restriction towards the United States, in the hope, no doubt, of exciting a reciprocal spirit on the part of the United States. Such a spirit might have led to an extension of the trade between the two countries. The American administration instead of reciprocating this liberal spirit, first postponed accepting the British proposition, and then rejected it. After Great Britain had waited with unexpected patience, and finding her proposition rejected, contrary to all reasonable calculation, she withdrew her proposition and indicated a system of retaliation. As soon as the American administration became apprised of this determination on the part of Great Britain, not resolutely *adhering to*, they instantly abandoned the restrictive system; and immediately offered to accept the rejected British proposition: But it then had become too late. The British government having taken the retaliating ground, *resolutely adheres to it*—and thus have the United States not only lost the West India trade, but, in all probability, will lose the whole British trade; whilst Great Britain is inviting European nations to trade upon reciprocal principles. The loss of the West India trade alone, is nothing compared with the loss of the whole British trade, and the gain of the commercial dissatisfaction of all Europe. This is one of the most obvious effects of the tariff—was predicted before its adoption, and is now verified.

Here, then, is offered the best evidence of the destructive effects of the tariff, both abroad and at home; and in losing this trade, could our orator have placed himself in a more pitiable condition? First, boasting of the irresistible effects of our restrictive system, *if resolutely adhered to*, then sneeringly reproaching Great Britain for refusing to yield at first; but being unable to resist the American restrictive policy, finally yielded to it—and the moment he found Great

Britain had resisted his system and put it at defiance, instead of resolutely adhering to it himself, he abandoned it; and, in effect, begged to be permitted to accept the rejected proposition. He is, in turn, rejected, and likely to continue so. For, Great Britain now resolutely adheres to her rejection. What an illustrious proof of the success of our restrictive system, when resolutely adhered to!!! What an unfortunate example for the gentleman from Virginia!!! How fortunate for our gasconading orator!!! After all this taunting, and gasconading, to prove recreant himself—to beg pardon in effect; and to be refused forgiveness!!! Could any attitude be more pitiable, and humiliating!!! Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask you in a spirit of mercy and moderation, what does the American administration deserve at the hands of the American people, for the loss of the West India trade alone—whether lost by ignorance or superciliousness, or carelessness, or by all together? Certainly the least punishment that can be awarded them, is the loss of their offices. It seems to me that they ought to have the grace to resign, and beg the people to forgive them, for bringing so great a loss upon them, when they had it perfectly in their power to have avoided it: perhaps to have placed our commerce with Great Britain on a better footing than it ever had been before. For, Mr. Speaker, let us suppose, for one moment, instead of all this miserable huckstering about the protection of domestic manufactures, the American government had reduced the duties upon British manufactures, particularly her cotton manufactures, to a fair revenue standard—say 10 per cent. ad valorem—what would have been the difference in the commercial intercourse between the two countries, from what it is under the unwise, unprincipled course which has been pursued? and what would have been the relative wealth and prosperity of the United States from what they now are, under this impoverishing, restrictive, crippling system?

Is it not highly probable, Mr. Speaker, that if revenue alone had been sought after, and the impost reduced, Great Britain might have been influenced by a reciprocating spirit, to have reduced her tariff upon American productions? In that case, the reciprocal benefits of a fair commercial intercourse between the two countries, would have been substituted in place of the present retaliatory, crippling system: a most unwise, unprofitable trial, of who could do the other most harm. Do you not think, sir, that a trial, of who shall do the other most good, would be far more advantageous to both? But, says our plotting, deluded orator—"The sole object of the tariff is to tax the produce "of foreign industry, with a view of promoting American industry." A most unwise contrivance for promoting American industry! It can never be promoted by crippling foreign industry. Surely the wiser plan to promote American industry, would be to promote foreign industry. This would be easily effected by a liberal, reciprocal, commercial intercourse. This would be in the true commercial spirit, which always tends to benefit all nations, which act under its benign influence. The principle of commercial intercourse, consists, in the interchange of goods between different nations, so as to supply

the reciprocal wants of each other. Money is used only to make up the difference of the value of the interchanged goods. The capacity of one nation, to purchase of another, therefore, depends upon the amount of goods, supplied by that one nation, for the other. If the government of the United States had taken freely British manufactured goods, the capacity of Great Britain to purchase our articles, would have been increased: and of course, Great Britain would purchase more of our goods, and at better prices, than can be done, when British goods are either prohibited, or heavily dutied. Suppose, instead of the commercial warfare, now waging between the United States, and Great Britain, evidently having its original foundation in the tariff, a free commercial intercourse were going on; such as was contained in the British overture, with such further concessions, as Great Britain would probably have made, upon a relaxation on our part in the duties upon her manufactures; what would be the difference in the relative wealth, and prosperity of the two countries, growing out of that intercourse, compared with it now? It could not be possible to estimate it; our miscalculating orator, with all his arithmetical results, from his sonorous statistics, could not come within hundreds of millions of dollars of the difference of the two cases. Here then, sir, is seen, one of the great errors, in the restrictive system; as well as one of its greatest evils. But, our gasconading orator looks for American prosperity, in the depression of foreign nations, and he never fails to enforce his ungracious policy, upon foreign nations, without gasconading, without tilt, and tournament. Our gasconading orator, once carried this disposition of his, for tilt and tournament so far, that, as well as I recollect, in another of his prize speeches in favor of the Greeks, overflowing with pathos, and sublimations, he held up one million of glittering American bayonets, in terror, to astonished Europe. Equally unfortunate has our deluded orator been, in the selection of another article, as an illustrious exemplification of the wisdom of the British restrictive system. It is the article of silk. It is not possible, that he could have hit upon any single article, which could have so completely put down his reasoning from the British restrictive policy, as the article of silk; because Great Britain, raising less silk, than sufficient for her home consumption, stands in relation to foreign nations, respecting the article of silk, precisely as the United States do, respecting the article of cotton, as regards the supply of the home market. But hear the dashing, mistaken orator, in his own words, from pages 21, 22:—

“ The success of her restrictive policy, is strikingly illustrated, in “ the article of silk. In the manufacture of that article, she labors “ under great disadvantages, besides that of not producing the raw “ material. She has subdued them all; and the increase of the manu- “ facture, has been most rapid. Although she is still unable to main- “ tain in foreign countries, a successful competition with the silks of “ France, of India, and of Italy, and therefore exports but little, she “ gives to two millions of the raw material, which she imports, in va- “ rious forms, a value of ten millions, which chiefly enter into British “ consumption. Let us suppose, that she was dependent upon foreign

"nations for these ten millions, what an injurious effect would it not have upon her commercial relations with them? The average of the exports of British manufactures, during the peace, exceeds the average of the most productive years of the war." Let me first meet the scheming orator's supposition, with another supposition. Suppose the unprofitable labor employed in Great Britain in giving £10,000,000 value, to £2,000,000 silk, under British bounty, was profitably employed, in some occupation, more suited to Great Britain, than manufacturing silk; and were to exchange the proceeds of this more profitable labor, for the silks manufactured in other countries, better suited to its manufacture, than to Great Britain; would there not be a reciprocal advantage to both countries, by this more profitable mode of employing their respective labor? Most certainly there would be; and in this omission of the extension of his supposition, will be found all the errors of the mistaken schemer upon this most important point. A mistake which will be found to pervade his whole mistaken scheming projects—in relation to the depression of the industry of foreign countries. It is now well known, that the British government has actually reduced the prohibitory duty of foreign silks, to a mere revenue duty; utterly denouncing the policy of protecting duties, particularly in regard to silk. The people engaged in that business made doleful wailings, as to the injurious effects of reducing the duty; but the repeal of the laws, for its reduction, has been refused; and the policy of the repeal re-asserted, and proclaimed by the British ministry, and nation. Here, then, is another most conspicuous example of the delusive errors, into which our miscalculating orator had fallen; as well as of his total destitution of the gift of prophecy. But, Mr. Speaker, lamentable is the reflection, that notwithstanding the clearest demonstrations of the destructive effect of the tariff, it is not only to be persevered in, in this country, but to be enlarged and extended to other objects. Now, Mr. Speaker, leaving these foreign, complex subjects, let us hear our sublimated orator, upon our own constitution. I propose to give the whole of his remarks upon that subject, because, having before expressed my views of the invidious spirit of those remarks, others may have the same opportunity of judging in that respect, with myself.

Extract—page 39.

"The last objection, with a notice of which, I shall trouble the committee, is, that the constitution does not authorize the passage of the bill. The gentleman from Virginia does not assert indeed, that it is inconsistent with the express provisions of that instrument, but he thinks it incompatible with the spirit of the constitution. If we attempt to provide for the internal improvement of the country, the constitution, according to some gentlemen, stands in our way. If we attempt to protect American industry against foreign policy and the rivalry of foreign industry, the constitution presents an insuperable obstacle. This constitution must be a most singular instrument; it seems to be made for any other people than our own. Its action is altogether foreign; Congress has power to lay duties and impose posts under no other limitation whatever than that of their being

"uniform throughout the United States. But they can only be imposed, according to the honorable gentleman, for the sole purpose of revenue. This is a restriction which we do not find in the constitution. No doubt revenue was a principal object with the framers of the constitution in investing Congress with the power. But in executing it, may not the duties and imposts be so laid as to secure domestic interest? Or is Congress denied all discretion as to the amount or the distribution of the duties and imposts? The gentleman from Virginia has, however, entirely mistaken the clause of the constitution on which we rely. It is that which gives to Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. The grant is plenary without any limitation whatever, and includes the whole power of regulation of which the subject to be regulated is susceptible. It is as full and complete a grant of the power as that is to declare war. What is a regulation of commerce? It implies the admission or exclusion of the objects of it and the terms. Under this power some articles, by the existing laws, are admitted freely; others are subjected to duties so high as to amount to their prohibition, and various rates of duties are applied to others. Under this power, laws of total non-intercourse with some nations, and embargoes, producing an entire cessation of commerce with all foreign countries, have been from time to time passed. These laws I have no doubt met with the entire approbation of the gentleman from Virginia. [Mr. Barbour said that he was not in Congress.] Wherever the gentleman was, whether on his farm, or in the pursuit of that profession, of which he is an ornament, I have no doubt, that he gave his zealous support to the laws referred to." Mr. Speaker, the effort of reading, has nearly exhausted my physical power. I must, therefore, make short work of this long quotation. One general reflection will almost suffice—Can you believe, sir, that any gentleman could speak with such contemptuous levity, of the constitution, as the quotation exhibits, who felt for it a sincere affection, and veneration? The first part of it is scarcely worth a remark. It is introduced to mark the taunting disrespect, with which the sublimated orator speaks of the constitution of his country. Indeed, sir, it is a subject of regret, and even indignation, to observe in the common course of Congressional debate, the contemptuous disrespect, with which all arguments drawn from the constitution of the United States, are treated by the dominant party: a debater who resorts to the constitution for an argument, seems to consider himself compelled, to accompany it with an apology, to screen himself from the reproach of his antagonist. The party seems to consider the constitution as an odious, old stumbling block in its way, whenever an usurped power is wanted to effect a favorite object, and seems determined to strip it of all energy, and through ridicule, to reduce it to contempt. Sir, I cannot help expressing my great surprise, at seeing our aspiring orator amongst the foremost in this kind of remark; and the more so, because when I first had an opportunity of seeing him in a political character, I really thought him the most ardent, and wildest democrat, I had ever seen. It was

in the year 1806 or 1807, when our splendid orator first made his appearance in the Senate of the United States. He came, sir, as I thought, with his whole soul enamoured of liberty. He seemed in his passage through the mountains, to have filled his imagination with brilliant metaphors, drawn from Alpine scenery, for the decoration of his adored goddess.

After reaching the Senate of the United States, upon the first occasion that occurred, he poured them forth in profusion, and in the first style of theatrical action, to the utter amazement of every beholder. He appeared to me to be a disciple of the first order of the old school of "liberty and equality, Thomas Paine and the rights of man"—The people's devotee. How changed!!! In 1824, our enchanted orator exhibits himself in the brilliant habitude of governmental liberty, governmental power, governmental grandeur, and governmental splendour—the governmental devotee, completely converting the liberty of the people, into the liberty of the government. He was then as close as wax, in the interpretation of the constitution, and would not allow a hair-breadth of departure from the specified powers. His most favorite clause then was, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." In 1824, our constitutional orator, of 1806, calls for *express written restrictions*, in the constitution, *against the exercise of power* by the practical *government*. For, says our metamorphosed orator, "*This is a restriction which we do not find in the constitution.*"—But, sir, the most unaccountable error, into which our orator has fallen will be found in these words: "Under this power, laws of non-intercourse with some nations, and embargoes, producing an entire cessation of commerce with all foreign countries, have been from time to time passed. These laws, I have no doubt, met with the entire approbation of the gentleman from Virginia. (Mr. Barbour said that he was not in Congress.) Wherever the gentleman was, whether on his farm, or in the pursuit of his profession, of which he was an ornament, I have no doubt he gave his zealous support to the laws referred to." Our deluded orator says, "under the power (to regulate commerce) laws of non-intercourse, and embargoes, producing an entire cessation of commerce with all foreign countries have been, from time to time, passed." I never heard, to the best of my recollection, before 1824, *when these new lights were first shed upon the constitution*, that the embargo, and non-intercourse laws were grounded upon the power to regulate commerce; and surely it would have been a most extraordinary mode of carrying that power into effect. These laws grew out of the belligerent acts of foreign nations, and were grounded upon the war power.—They were expressly declared to be intended, as acts of resistance against the aggressing belligerents. As soon as those belligerent acts were committed against the United States, they became invested with all the rights of war. They had a right to judge of their own interests in regard to the aggressing belligerents, and to pursue their own policy for redress. They did so; and determined upon a com-

mercial, mitigated warfare, in the first instance, grounded upon the rights of war, instead of an open war at arms. The deluded orator is therefore, entirely mistaken in supposing that the embargo and non-intercourse laws were founded upon the power to regulate commerce. It is not at all necessary to go into a critical definition of the extent of the power to regulate commerce. It is sufficient to say ; it does not involve the power to protect manufactures, nor any other original, substantive, independent power. Powers of that description have nothing of the incidental derivative character in them ; and whenever it is proved that a power, is an original, substantive, independent power, it is proved, that it cannot honestly be exercised as a power incidental to, or derivative from, any other power. The power to protect manufactures is an original, distinct, substantive, and independent power, and paramount, in its practical effects, to the power to regulate commerce ; and, therefore, cannot be usurped as incidental to the subordinate power. But, Mr. Speaker, this constitutional discussion is perfectly useless ; and I wonder, for that reason, that our daring, dashing orator, should have wasted the little breath he has, upon so unimportant a subject. He has set up a claim to powers paramount to the constitution, involving the power to protect manufactures and all other governmental powers.—Powers unlimited, and therefore it was perfectly idle : a mere waste of time, to examine the provisions of the constitution. Our orator says—“The great desideratum in political economy, is the same as in private pursuits ; that is, what is the best application of the aggregate industry of a nation, that can be honestly made to produce the largest sum of national wealth. Labor is the source of all wealth ; but it is not natural labor only.” Now, Mr. Speaker, suppose you give our aspiring orator, his great desideratum of political economy—the produce of the whole labor, and industry of the country, to be distributed at his own uncontrolled will, for national objects, would it be necessary for him to look to the constitution for the derivation of powers ? Certainly not : Because his claims to power include all powers. Why then look to the constitution, for a moment, in search of any power ?—Equally unnecessary would it be to look to the constitution for written restrictions against the exercise of any power whatever ; because, the general, unlimited, paramount power, would obliterate the whole. Once surrender the power to the practical government, here claimed by our orator, and your written constitution is gone !! Its forms may be preserved for a time, but its organized departments, instead of being checks to each other, would instantly coalesce, and become combined for the purposes of personal aggrandizement. The first Roman Emperors carried on their absolute government, under the name of the Senate, for three hundred years, after all the powers of the Senate had been completely usurped by the Emperors, and nothing was left to the Senate but its name—the Roman Senate. So the American President, at this moment, often most irreverently invokes the name of the constitution, after he has usurped, as I think, all powers, and reduced the constitution to an unmeaning nullity. If the President’s claims to unlimited power be awarded to

him by the people, his successors will, probably for **some** time, follow his example; but all the protections for the liberties of the American people, intended by the constitution, will be utterly disregarded, and blotted out forever. Mr. Speaker, if any doubt could exist, after all these extraordinary declarations of our dashing, sublimated orator, as to his determination to obliterate every vestige of constitutional restrictions, upon the powers of the general government, I think none can remain, after reading the following bold and daring avowals, in which the federative feature of the constitution, is refused to be recognized, and the whole of our fundamental institutions, asserted to be consolidated into "one government."

Extract—page 41.

"Mr. Chairman, our confederacy comprehends, within its vast limits great diversity of interests, agricultural—planting—farming—commercial—navigating—fishing—manufacturing. No one of these interests is felt in the same degree, and cherished with the same solicitude, throughout all parts of the Union. Some of them are peculiar to particular sections of our common country. *But all these great interests, are confided to the protection of "one" government, to the fate of 'one' ship; and a most gallant ship it is, with a noble crew.* If we prosper, and are happy, protection must be extended to all; it is due to all. It is the great principle on which obedience is demanded from all." Yet agriculture is excluded.—In its main branches, it gets no protection whatever. God forbid! that all these great interests should be confided to the protection of "one government"—Raymond's government, I presume, "one and indivisible." And when by this great principle "*protection*"—government has a right to obedience from all. Bold doctrine this!! Until now, I really hoped and understood that all these great interests were confided to the protection of five and twenty governments, and were most wisely distributed amongst them by a federative constitution. But now it is asserted, for the first time, as far as I recollect, that all the great interests of agriculture, planting, farming, commercial, navigating, fishing, manufacturing, and all others embraced by the confederacy, are confided to the protection of "one government." If so, what interests are confided to the protection of the State government? "None at all!!" All interests whatever, are confined to *one General Government*. The States are reduced to empty corporations, stripped of every atom of sovereignty. Is it not wonderful, that when the people of 24 States, *in their associated characters, as States, are made parties to the Federal Government by their written constitutions*, that all the diversified interests embraced by our confederacy, are confided to *one government*? Particularly when in the same constitution, there is an express written reservation, of sovereign rights to the States, and to the people. Until lately, it seemed to be almost the universal opinion, that the great value, and beauty of the federative principle, consisted, in confiding the protection of local interests, to local authorities; and confiding the general interests, to the protection of some general authority. The same pretension to universal power is since set up by the President,

He claims jurisdiction over all "the mechanical, and elegant arts;" and, in short, over every object of governmental power. According to these administrative claims to power, is it not idle to talk of the reservation of rights to the states, or to the people!!! and is not the question, most alarming, but evidently, now put, to the American people, *to determine whether or not, they prefer their own written constitution, to no constitution at all?* and to submit all their rights, without any definition whatever, to "one government?" It cannot escape observation, that, by way of asserting, more strongly, the indivisible character of this "one government," our enchanted orator, figuratively, according to custom, likens this "one government" to "one ship." For, says the orator, "to the fate of one ship, and a most gallant ship it is, with a noble crew." It is not possible to have chosen a figure, more emblematical of the "unity, and indivisibility" of the government, than the fate of *one* ship, "and a most gallant ship it is, with a noble crew." This could not possibly, however, be the same ship and crew which our thoughtless, dashing orator, was describing, when contrasting them with the noblest ship and crew, in the world, according to our sublimated orator—"Old England."—Not the same which was put below, disinherited Ireland, and indolent, bigotted Spain !!—With this view of the powers of the practical government, is it not perfectly unavailing to look to the constitution of the United States for the distribution of powers, or for restraining provisions against the exercise of these powers. So our enchanted orator must have considered it, when in this discussion, he first tauntingly sported with, and then skipped over the constitutional question. But, Mr. Speaker, as if our dashing orator was determined that not a vestige of doubt should remain of his opinion, as to the utter incompetency of our federative constitution, in its present form, for the present objects of the American people in their new relations, and organizations, in page 44, he proceeds to remark—"And is not government called upon, by every stimulating motive, to adapt its policy to the actual condition, and extended growth of our great Republic? At the commencement of our constitution, almost the whole population of the United States was confined between the Alleghany Mountains and the Atlantic Ocean. Since that epoch, the Western part of N. York, of Pennsylvania, of Virginia, all the Western States and Territories have been principally peopled. Prior to that period we had scarcely any interior. *An interior has sprung up as it were by enchantment, and along with it new interests and new relations, requiring the parental protection of government. Our policy should be modified accordingly, so as to comprehend all, and sacrifice none,*" What, Mr. Speaker, is the meaning of all this? Can a doubt exist as to our dashing orator's meaning? That under the new interests and relations, recently sprung up among the people of the several states of the United States—the original constitution is found to be entirely incompetent; and that the only relief against the mischief of that incompetency, must be found in *the parental protection of "one government."* "Our policy, says our orator, should be modified so as to comprehend all interests, and sacrifice

none." No convention is to be called to remedy the evils, if they exist, by a written constitution, adapted to these new interests and new relations ; but the *policy* of the "one" general government, grounded upon its parental protection, is to be modified, so as to comprehend the interests of all, and sacrifice the interests of none, and this governmental policy is deemed perfectly competent to remedy the evils. Mr. Speaker ! *does this not amount to a power claimed in the part of this "one" parental government to legislate in all cases for the good of the whole, as policy may dictate, without any reference whatever to written constitutional distributions of power?* If so, can any thing be more alarming to the friends of written constitutions, than these claims to undefined, unlimited power, actually practised upon by the administration of the general government ? Believe me, sir, if these claims to power, so boldly set forth, should not be corrected by the interposition of the American people, and I most seriously fear it is too late, the philanthropist, the lover of liberty, the patriot, and the friends of the rights of man, have all to fear, and nothing to hope, from the once vaunted discoveries of the great American principles in governmental science. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is past the usual hour of adjournment, and sir, it is with most unpleasant and mortifying feelings that I am now compelled to tell you, that I am physically exhausted. Yet I have one interesting point, which I wish to present to the views of the house. It is too, sir, a subject I have deeply at heart. May I then once more trespass upon your liberal indulgence in asking for another adjournment of the debate ?

Permit me this morning, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate yourself, and this honorable house, and to felicitate myself, upon approaching so far in this discussion, as to see the end of the laborious, and perplexed task which an irresistible sense of duty had imposed upon me ; a task, which, so far, has been executed under every possible disadvantage.—Under a state of physical debility, which has barely left me the power to stand here before you, sir, long enough to express the opinions I entertain upon this momentous subject ; laboring too, sir, every moment under apprehensions of being rendered absolutely unable to proceed, and at the same time, embarrassed with the most unpleasant recollection of the time I had consumed in the discussion ; so much, sir, were my sensibilities excited from this consideration, that I would have spared you the indulgent attention, I am now receiving, were it not for the peculiar character of that portion of the subject remaining yet unexamined,—its sectional bearings. I have designedly reserved that interesting part of the subject for the last, with a view of presenting it in one compact form, and of giving our splendid orator the full benefit of his several views of it, scattered over the different parts of his multifarious, complicated speech. The essential parts of them will be found in the following quotations :

Extract—page 15.

"The distribution of the articles of our exports throughout the United States, cannot fail to fix the attention of the committee. Of the \$47,155,408, to which they amounted last year, three articles alone, (cotton, rice, and tobacco,) composed together \$28,549,177. Now

these articles are chiefly produced to the South. And if we estimate that portion of our population who are actually engaged in their culture, it would probably not exceed two millions. Thus, then, less than one-fifth of the whole population of the United States produced upwards of one half, nearly two-thirds, of the entire value of the exports of the last year."

Extract—page 25.

"The circumstance of its degradation unfits it for the manufacturing arts. The well being of the other, and the larger part of our population, requires the introduction of those arts. What is to be done in this conflict? The gentleman would have us abstain from adopting a policy called for by the interest of the greater and freer part of our population. But is that reasonable? Can it be expected that the interests of the greater part should be made to bend to the condition of the servile part of our population? That, in effect, would be to make us the slaves of slaves. I went, with great pleasure, along with my southern friends, and I am ready again to unite with them in protesting against the exercise of any legislative power, on the part of Congress, over that delicate subject, because it was my solemn conviction, that Congress was interdicted, or at least not authorized by the constitution, to exercise any such legislative power. And I am sure that the patriotism of the South may be exclusively relied upon to reject a policy which should be dictated by considerations altogether connected with that degraded class, to the prejudice of the residue of our population. But does not a perseverance in the foreign policy, as it now exists, in fact make all parts of the Union, not planting, tributary to the planting parts?"

Extract—page 36.

"Is it true, that the interests of these great sections of our country are irreconcilable with each other? Are we reduced to the sad and afflicting dilemma of determining which shall fall a victim to the prosperity of the other? Happily, I think, there is no such distressing alternative. If the North, the West, and the East, formed an independent state, unassociated with the South, can there be a doubt that the restrictive system would be carried to the point of prohibition of every foreign fabric of which they produce the raw material, and which they could manufacture? Such would be their policy, if they stood alone; but they are fortunately connected with the South, which believes its interest to require a free admission of foreign manufactures. Here then is a case for mutual concession, for fair compromise. The bill under consideration presents this compromise. It is a medium between the absolute exclusion and the unrestricted admission of the produce of foreign industry. It sacrifices the interest of neither section to that of the other; neither, it is true, gets all that it wants, nor is subject to all that it fears. But it has been said that the South obtains nothing in this compromise. Does it lose any thing? is the first question. I have endeavoured to prove that it does not, by showing that a mere transfer is effected in the source of the supply of its consumption from Europe to America: and that the loss, whatever it may be, of the sale of its great staple in Europe, is compensated by the new market created in America. But does the South really gain nothing in this compromise?"

Extract—pages 45, 46.

“Behold the mass of petitions which lie on our table, earnestly and anxiously entreating the protecting interposition of Congress against the ruinous policy which we are pursuing. Will these petitioners, comprehending all orders of society, entire states and communities, public companies and private individuals, spontaneously assembling, cease in their humble prayers by your lending a deaf ear? Can you expect that these petitioners, and others, in countless numbers, that will, if you delay the passage of this bill, supplicate your mercy, should contemplate their substance gradually withdrawn to foreign countries, their ruin slow, but certain and as inevitable as death itself, without one expiring effort? You think the measure injurious to you; we believe our preservation depends upon its adoption. Our convictions, mutually honest, are equally strong. What is to be done? I invoke that saving spirit of mutual concession under which our blessed constitution was formed, and under which alone it can be happily administered. I appeal to the South—to the high-minded, generous, and patriotic South—with which I have so often co-operated, in attempting to sustain the honour and to vindicate the rights of our country. Should it not offer, upon the altar of the public good, some sacrifice of its peculiar opinions? Of what does it complain? A possible temporary enhancement in the objects of consumption. Of what do we complain? A total incapacity, produced by the foreign policy, to purchase, at any price, necessary foreign objects of consumption. In such an alternative, inconvenient only to it, ruinous to us, can we expect too much from Southern magnanimity?”

Before I enter into the examination of the character of the proposition of mutual concession, proposed by our bewildered orator, between the North, West and East, as one section, and the South as the other, permit me merely to point to two or three instances of that spirit of insincerity and disingenuousness, which characterises various parts of this glittering speech. The bewildered orator observes in page 25—“The circumstance of its degradation (slave population) unfits it for the manufacturing arts. The well being of the other, and larger part of our population requires the introduction of those arts. What is to be done in this conflict? The Southerns would have us abstain from adopting a policy called for by the greater and freer parts of our population. But is that reasonable? Can it be expected that the interest of the greater parts, should be made to bend to the servile parts of our population? *That in effect would be to make us slaves of slaves.*” Is not this, sir, a most invidious statement, and preposterous conclusion? Is there one gentleman here present, who can believe, our intrepid orator believed himself? What was it, which was to make “us slaves of slaves?” Abstaining from adopting a policy called for by the greater, and freer part of our population. What policy is that? Abstaining from passing the tariff bill, the policy in question. Abstaining, then, from passing the tariff bill is to make the freer and greater part of our population “the slaves of slaves.” Is that possible? Is there one human being who believes, that our orator, most intrepid in assertion, did himself believe so? Were the greater, and freer part of our population “the slaves of slaves,” at the moment our orator was making this most

absurd, and ridiculous conclusion? If not, then "the slaves of slaves," would, leaving the greater and freer part of our population in the same situation, have the wonderful effect, of converting into "the "slaves of slaves," those very persons, whom our orator dignifies with the appellation of being, *at the very moment of his making the unfounded assertion*, the greater, and freer part of our population!—Here, then, is to be seen, only invidious disingenuousness. For what could be more invidious, when our orator was himself representing a slave-holding state, perhaps a slave-holder himself, than to abandon the slave-holders and unite himself, under the appellation of "us," with the greater, and freer part of our population? Thus vainly attempting to recommend himself to the non-slave-holding states, by throwing from himself the obloquy, of being of the slave holding class, both in his individual, and representative character; and what can be more disingenuous than the false and preposterous conclusion he draws from his invidious premises? But hear him still further. In the same page our orator observes, "and I am sure, that the patriotism of the South, may be exclusively relied upon, to reject a policy which should be dictated by considerations altogether connected with that degraded class, to the prejudice of the residue of our population."—And in page 45, "I appeal to the South, the high-minded, generous, patriotic South, with which, I have so often co-operated, in attempting to sustain the honor, and vindicate the rights of our country. Should it not offer upon the altar of the public good, some sacrifice of its peculiar opinions?" What a pathetic appeal to the patriotism, and magnanimity of the South, to sacrifice something of its "*peculiar opinions*." I find it difficult here to determine, Mr. Speaker, whether this ridiculous, pathetic appeal, displays more vanity, and egotism, on the part of the sublimated orator, than it does, of his utter contempt of the understandings of the Southerns? Our sublimated orator here calls upon the patriotism, and magnanimity of the South, to make some *sacrifice of its peculiar opinions*. Our trafficking orator well knew, that it was not a sacrifice of the *peculiar opinions* of the South, that he was calling for, but a sacrifice of its *peculiar interests, of its peculiar money*; and by way of inducing the South to make this sacrifice upon the altar of the public good, he invokes its patriotism, and its magnanimity. Mr. Speaker, would not the Southerns be very foolish patriots to give up their interests, the proceeds of their labor, their money, because our electioneering orator tells them that it would be patriotism, and magnanimity in them to do so? Surely the Southerns must be very foolish patriots to yield to such a ridiculous call. But this sacrifice is to be made upon the altar of public good. What fascinating, honeyed words! And what is the altar of public good, demanding this great sacrifice? It is the protection of manufactures. It is to give the proceeds of the labor of the Southerns to those who labor not for them. It is to encourage the idleness, and to pamper the wealth of manufacturing stock-holders. This is our coaxing orator's most sacred altar of public good. It is not possible to conceive, that our trafficking orator, was speaking in the sincerity of his heart to his beloved Southern friends, whilst using this language to them, professed to be ushered forth, both pathetically and sympathetically, whilst he was thus adroitly engaged in picking their pockets of

their cash, as a fund on their part of concessions, to the North, West, and East. Here, then, is another conspicuous example of insincerity. In page 43, our bewildered orator, in the true sectional spirit, asks, "If the North, the West, and the East formed an independent state, unassociated with the South, can there be a doubt that the restrictive system would be carried to a point of prohibition to every foreign fabric, of which they produce the raw material, and which they could manufacture?" Would it be possible for the bewildered orator to answer his own question in the affirmative? I should not think it possible. Such a measure would certainly be at war with their best interests. They most certainly would not, unless in a state of delirium. In that supposed case, the sectional aspect of the question would disappear, and it would become a question between different occupations within the same sections? Would it be possible, in that case, to believe, that all other occupations would be willing to be taxed—to give up a portion of the proceeds of their labor, for the purpose of favoring the manufacturing class? What, in that case, would become of their beloved navigation and commerce? No, sir, leave the North, the West, and the East to themselves, and the real enchantment in the protection to manufactures, would instantly lose all its charms; that enchantment now consists of the glittering cash of the South. The West, however, for the moment, is artificially trafficked out of its place. Its true interests and natural position are with the South. The delusion of the West, has grown out of peculiar circumstances. They are transitory, and the delusion will soon pass away.

I am surprised, that whilst our trafficking orator was indulging in these imaginary reveries, that it did not occur to his contemplation *once to think*, in the supposed cases of the North, the West and the East becoming unassociated with the South, what would become of all their mechanical arts? their industry? their fabrics of industry? their wealth? their prosperity? Surely this subject would be well worth his deepest contemplation, before he reduces the supposed case to reality, by an unprincipled tribute, enforced by an unprincipled combination. More especially when he recollects the rivalships for Southern fabrics in other parts of the world; and the irresistible influence that circumstance would necessarily give to the South in any future policy it might adopt in relation to that subject with other nations.—For surely, our threatening, deluded orator, ought deeply to consider; and incessantly to recollect; that the southerns can command extensive supplies, of articles of the first necessity, to European nations, and can become literally, their best "*customers*." Not—"rivals."—Whilst the North, and East, have no supplies of consequence for those nations—but are, literally their—"rivals"—Not—"customers." European nations well know, how to estimate these things; and the southerns, well know, how to profit by them. Here, then, sir, is seen another example, and an extremely delicate one, of the hazardous, and disingenuous suggestions of our bewildered orator, in relation to the sectional interests he has most unwisely, and wantonly conjured up, by his selfish, electioneering tariff schemes. Let us now, Mr. Speaker, proceed critically to examine, the great principle of mutual concession proposed by this trafficking tariff-schemer. After, in page 15, pointing to an amount

of exports of twenty-eight million five hundred and forty-nine thousand one hundred and seventy-seven dollars, an ample fund for concessions, he seems to think, on the part of the Southerns, whilst he does not anywhere point to a single jot of cash, as a fund on the part of the Northerns, Westerns and Easterns. In page 43, our bewildered, trafficking orator, observes—"Here, then, is a case for mutual concession—for fair compromise? It is a medium between the absolute exclusion, and the unrestricted admission of the produce of foreign industry. It sacrifices the interest of neither section, to that of the other; neither it is true, gets all that it wants, nor is subject to all that it fears. But it has been said, that the South obtains nothing in this compromise. Does it lose any thing, is the first question?"

Again, page 45: "What is to be done? I invoke the saving spirit of mutual concession, under which our blessed constitution was formed, and under which alone it can be happily administered. I appeal to the South, to the high-minded, generous, patriotic South—with which I have so often co-operated, in attempting to sustain the honor, and to vindicate the rights of our country. Should it not offer, upon the altar of the public good, some sacrifice of its peculiar opinions?" Here, then, sir, we have the principle of reciprocal concession proposed by our trafficking orator? "It is a medium (he says) between the absolute exclusion and the unrestricted admission of the produce of foreign industry." Is this suggestion of an absolute exclusion from all foreign commerce thrown out, merely in *terrorem* to the Southerns, as a proposition that may be within the power of the North, West, and East, and which may be adopted, in case the Southerns will not give the Northerns and Easterns, (the deluded Westerns have no lot in the matter,) by way of bounty upon their domestic manufactured goods, perhaps one-half more than they are worth? at least one half more than the Southerns can purchase them for of foreign nations, but for the prohibitory duties? It is not possible to believe that the trafficking orator could be in earnest in making this proposition, upon the possibility of its being carried into effect in any state of things whatsoever. If not, it is a mere threat, and *its value* consists in the *terror* intended to be inspired by it. Such a measure would be worse than Buonaparte's continental system, which contributed, more than any thing else, to send him to St. Helena—and yet our dashing orator hesitates not to call in the aid of this unfeeling despot, as affording an appropriate precedent for his own despotic tariff scheme. At the very moment of holding out this suggestion, the trafficking orator well knew that its adoption was impossible.—It could then be only in *terrorem*; and *its value* could consist only in the *terror* it would inspire in the Southerns. Could our trafficking bewildered orator calculate that the Southerns would *value* this article of terror very highly, as a fund of concession on the part of the Northerns, the Westerns, and the Easterns, when, in return for this terror, an immense amount of the money of the Southerns, produced by their labor, is demanded, as the fund of concession on their part? Is it possible to find any thing like justice, principle, morality, or equity, in these professions of reciprocal concessions?

of fair compromise? Is it not sheer plunder; unprincipled tribute? Is it not coerced? But, Mr. Speaker, this disingenuous, terrific threat of our entire exclusion from foreign commerce, is not the only concession of pretended value offered to the Southerns, by the electioneering, trafficking orator, in behalf of the Northerns, Westerns and Easterns. The Southerns loss of the European market is proposed to be compensated by the "new market created in America;" what our plotting, sonorous orator calls "a home market." To ascertain the value of this concession, it becomes necessary to inquire, what are the nature and value of the old market lost, compared with the new market gained? The old market consisted of both the foreign and domestic markets, grounded upon a principle of competition, except so far as duties then existing on foreign articles, gave a preference to the domestic market: to which it has no claim whatever, founded on right. The concession now proposed, on the part of the Northerns, Westerns and Easterns, is "a new market"—"a home market." This new market is grounded upon a principle of monopoly. It proposes to exclude foreign competition, or to duty foreign goods so high, as to give a monopoly to domestic goods; a market grounded upon a principle of monopoly, then, is offered as a concession for a market grounded on a principle of competition. Of what value is this proposed market to the Southerns; particularly a home market in Boston, for Kentucky or Louisiana? a long home? Certainly none, most certainly none—much worse than none. Because, to get this concession, the Southerns have to give up a better market. But is this market of monopoly—this home market, hundreds and thousands of miles off—to be freely given? O no! It must be paid for by the Southerns—most dearly paid for. But in fifty years—God willing—the Southerns are to be blessed with a conversion of this new market of monopoly into another "new market of competition"—still confined to home competition. This market of competition the Southerns had, before they were stripped of it by the tariff, extending the competition to foreign markets. Why, then, suspend it for fifty years, to get it restored in a less beneficial form than it before was?—and, in the mean time, pay for the monopoly market an enormous tribute? Is not this pretended concession, not only an unprincipled plunder of the purse, but a restraint upon the rights and liberties, and a mockery upon the understandings of the Southerns? But, Mr. Speaker, further concessions are offered. In page 44, our trafficking orator asks: "But does the South really gain nothing by this compromise?" He then answers—"The consumption of the other sections, though somewhat restricted, is left open by this bill, to foreign fabrics, purchased by Southern staples. So far its operation is beneficial to the South, and prejudicial to the industry of other sections; and *that is the point of mutual concession.*" Did the world ever before witness such a display of sophisticated absurdities? Really, our bewildered orator has attenuated his notions of concession to such an infinite degree of fineness, as almost to escape the nicest vision of my mental optics. What is it, that our puzzled orator tells you, *is the point of mutual concession?* It is that

other sections are left free to purchase foreign imported articles, made of Southern fabrics? I cannot find any other meaning for this sophisticated sentence, than that the other sections are not stripped of their rights, to purchase foreign imported articles, because they are made of southern fabrics; nor can I discern any injury done to their industry, by leaving them the right to invest their money to the best advantage. These rights are highly valuable to the other sections; but can afford very little value to the Southerns. These are strange notions of our perplexed orator. To refrain from doing wrongs to other sections, to avoid stripping other sections of their rights and liberties, is to be considered as concessions of so much value to the Southerns, as to demand pay for them in money: Yes! to compel the Southerns to pay the other sections, nearly double the value of the worth of their manufactured goods. Instead of concessions, consisting of attenuated notions, and fairy tales, I call for something more solid—something resembling more the cash demanded, as the only acceptable fund of concession from the Southerns. By the cunning, unprincipled contrivances of the tariff bill, very large amounts of cash, are drawn from the South, to the North and the East;—I call,—I loudly call for sums of equal amount to be returned to the South, to encourage, to protect, to invigorate, the crippled agriculture of the South. Surely this equitable request cannot be denied by the sublimated orator, who promised to agriculture the first and best offerings in the gift of the government. But, sir, in this delusive, fallacious proposition for concessions—for fair compromise, may be seen, the unprincipled effects, of our deluded orator's great desideratum in political economy. The power of distributing the whole proceeds of national industry, for pretended national objects. Whilst he shows a fund, approaching thirty millions of dollars in money, on the part of the Southerns, he does not exhibit a cent, in money, as a fund for concessions, and fair compromise, on the part of the North, West, and East. He must therefore, act upon the principle, that the North, West, and East, are joint owners with the Southerns in the proceeds of their labor, and upon that ground, he makes, what he pretends to consider, an equitable distribution of it, amongst the whole, taking a great share, from those to whom it belongs, and giving it to whom it does not belong, in violation of the sacred principle of private property. He assimilates this case too, to the concessions made in the formation of our "blessed constitution"—pathetic enough, funny enough.—But there is not the least resemblance in the characters of these concessions. In the case of our blessed, contemned constitution, the funds for concessions consisted of political rights. The North, and East, made concessions from their own funds, of their own political rights. Here money is the subject for concession, for fair competition; and here, no fund of property; of money whatever, is offered on their part. But the whole fund of property for concession, belongs to the South. The preposterous conceptions, and fairy tales offered the Southerns, in lieu of their cash, can only be regarded, as insults to their understandings. Our electioneering orator having, for his own purposes,

conjured up these sectional difficulties and perplexities, as well as his terrific alarm from the action of foreign industry upon American industry, pathetically puts this question, in his own fancied, perplexed dilemma, "What is to be done?" Nothing surely, can be easier, than to answer this question. Do nothing at all—Be honest—Give to every one the produce of his own labor—Teach American citizens to be honest, and industrious—Teach them to rely upon the *proceeds of their own honest industry; and not upon the proceeds of the honest industry of others.* Teach them good morals; and let them know that it is dishonest—that it is disreputable, that it is unmanly to pick the pockets of others, *for their protection, for their encouragement, for their emolument.* This course is very simple, very moral, and very easy; whilst the unprincipled plunder, authorised by the tariff bill, is necessarily attended with tricks, contrivances, and perplexities innumerable.

Is it not, Mr. Speaker, a subject of curious commentary upon the devices practised to sustain the ruinous provisions of this bill, to observe, that at the very moment the licensed manufacturer has his fingers in the pockets of the Southerns, to plunder his bounty; authorised by the bill, he is calling the Southerns, to guard themselves against the Englishman? If not, by the action of his industry—upon the American industry, the Englishman will rifle the Southerns' pockets of every cent.—Not so, sir, a laughable conceit!—The Englishman at the time has not his fingers in the Southerns' pockets, whilst the manufacturer actually has, and is actually engaged in plundering his licensed bounty. Trust me, sir, the Englishman's industry will never hurt yours. It may enhance its value, by enhancing the market for its productions; but never can hurt it.—Equally unfounded is the charge against the British government of injurious designs upon American industry; a mere tub to the whale. So far from it, that even after passing the tariff law, having for its avowed object the destruction of British industry, the British government, in a liberal spirit of reciprocity, offered to put her colonial trade upon a better footing with the United States, than it ever had been, and doubtless would have extended the same spirit of liberal reciprocity, to other branches of commerce, had it not been ungraciously repulsed, in consequence of the most unfortunate preference, given to this unwise, injurious, and crippling restrictive system.—Mr. Speaker, whilst the sectional bearings given to this ruinous tariff, by our aspiring orator, for the purpose of insuring its success, is admitted in its full extent, it ought ever to be recollected that it has its individual bearings also. That its injurious bearings are as obvious upon different occupations, as upon sectional interests.—And its oppressive effects are perhaps more sorely felt by the wheat-growers, than any other descriptions of persons; whilst their peculiar interests till now, have scarcely received the least attention. It is high time that the wheat-growers should speak out, and speak audibly. Whenever they do, they must be heard. It should ever be recollected too, that the wheat-growers residing in the manufacturing states, are burthened in the same manner, with the wheat-

growers in the non-manufacturing states. The only benefits they receive, consist in the brisker circulation of cash drawn from other states by the manufacturers; but if they will make the calculation, they will find, that incidental circumstance affords a poor compensation for the increased duties they pay upon all articles of their own consumption, whether foreign or domestic. Even the journeymen laborers, the actual operatives in the manufacturing establishments, are most grievously taxed under the law. The bounty being given upon the manufactured article, and not upon the wages of the day laborer, he pays his portion of the unjust tax in common with other citizens. Yes, the operative shoemaker in settling his account with his master, is charged the bounty price upon the shoes of his own making, as other citizens are; and so of every other actual operative in every other manufacturing occupation. It is this principle, which has filled Great Britain with beggars, and with paupers. The same policy will produce the same effects in any other country in the world, which shall continue it long enough to produce its necessary natural effects. The only persons who receive the enormous bounty upon the domestic manufactured goods, are either the stockholders of the manufacturing scrip, or the owners of manufacturing establishments. Surely the other classes of society, whether inhabitants of manufacturing states or not, can never long submit to the payment of this most unprincipled tribute, grounded upon a doctrine, directly at war with the great, beneficial, genuine American principle of written constitutions; and when its natural and necessary tendency must be to make the rich, richer, and the poor, poorer. Mr. Speaker, it would be too great a task to undertake a general review and recapitulation of this comprehensive, and multifarious subject; but, sir, there is one point, which I beg to be permitted to press upon your most serious consideration. In it will be found, the only remaining hope for the preservation of human liberty. You cannot but observe, sir, that this unprincipled tariff scheme, is grounded in its most essential parts, upon a difference in sectional interests, tending in its operations directly to disunion: That it strikes directly at the root of the federative principle, the essential basis of the constitution of the United States. That instead of leaving the local authorities to legislate for local interests, it usurps the power of legislating for the whole. It thus not only sets at defiance all the restraining provisions of the constitution, but subverts some of the great fundamental principles, heretofore held most dear by the American people. It strikes directly at the great principle of security in taxation, to wit: *Representation and Taxation*, as essentially reciprocal. The great American principle in taxation is, that the people shall not be taxed, except by their Representatives; and the security of the people against unnecessary taxation consists in the similarity of interests between the Representative and the constituent. The Representative himself, pays his due share of the taxes he imposes upon his constituents.

But, sir, under the usurped power to pass the tariff bill, upon the sole ground of protecting manufactures, the duties are imposed, not

by the representatives of the people most burthened, but by representatives from other sections of the country. The great principle of security grounded upon a similarity of interests, between the representatives and the people, is thus necessarily set at nought. But that is not all—The duty is laid by representatives, who think at least, they have different interests from the people, who pay the duty, and instead of paying their due share of it, consider themselves, or their constituents, the actual receivers of the tax imposed. The utter subversion of this only principle of security to the people, surely cannot long be tolerated. This consideration is of itself sufficient to show the unconstitutionality of the tariff, if there were no other—at least, to show that it is directly against the fundamental principle upon which the constitution is founded; or, if this power be contained in the constitution, it must be admitted to have been introduced by mistake, and ought instantly to be eradicated, because it is against the original basis of its own foundation. It would not be possible to give a stronger exemplification of the correctness of these views of the subject, than by recurring to the vote upon the late rejected woollens bill. I have examined the yeas, and nays, upon the passage of that bill, and I find every vote, except one, and that one from the remote western parts of Virginia, against the bill, from the Potomac to the Gulf of Mexico inclusive. Whatever difference may have existed in the political opinions of the representatives of the people, inhabiting that extensive scene of country, they all united upon that most important question; and, with one voice, used their best efforts to save their constituents from the unprincipled tax; whilst the imposition was proposed to be made by representatives from other sections of the country—having, as they conceived, different, and opposite interests. Here, then, is seen an attempt to impose taxes, the most unjust, against the unanimous remonstrances and votes of the sections of country, upon which the burthen was to fall most heavily—completely inverting the great principle in taxation, secured by American fundamental constitutions. All this mischief is done, too, against the solemn warnings and dying entreaties of Washington. In his last legacy, his Farewell Address to the American People, Washington's chief object was, to demonstrate the absolute necessity for the preservation of our fundamental institutions, that each department, in the complicated organization of our government, should be kept, within the sphere of action, assigned to it, by the fundamental laws; that neither should ever attempt to encroach upon the rights, of any other. For this great object, he solemnly invoked, and entreated the administrators of our government to act within, and be content with, the power assigned to it, under the written constitutional distribution of powers. He calls upon them in the most pathetic and parental manner, to avoid the introduction of sectional differences of interests in the administration of the practical government. He solemnly invokes them not to set the North against the South, nor the East against the West. He well knew that the destruction of the constitution was more likely to arise from the introduction of the differences of sectional interests, in the practical administration, than from any other cause whatever. Yet, this fatal tariff bill, in a spirit directly hostile to his prophetic, parental warnings, is founded mainly upon

difference in sectional interests. Will you not, sir, attend to the solemn warning of Washington—emphatically designated the Father of his Country. Permit me to say, sir, that yesterday I felt the strongest emotions, when I was raising my feeble voice to protect the federative principle against sectional interests. I found it drowned in the roaring of the cannon in the Capital Square, in commemoration of the birth day of Washington. I became, on the instant, more awfully impressed with his solemn warnings against the introduction of sectional interests, and the destruction of the federative principle, than I had ever before been upon any former occasion. The unexampled blessings which the American people had enjoyed under the benign influence of the federative principle, were presented fresh to my memory ; and I could not resist the reflections, arising from the unaccountable fluctuations in human affairs : that the American people, in the plenitude of the most successful experiments, upon the great American principle ; in the full enjoyment of its unparalleled political blessings, should, capriciously throw the whole away, in preference for the despotic principles of Europe—hitherto untried in America. It brought to my recollection too, the more recent warnings of the nation's guest, the apostle of liberty, Fayette—made directly to our President, under circumstances, which could not fail to be most impressive—In reply to the President's farewell address to Fayette, which was of a character to do him the highest honor; Fayette, most warningly, and emphatically replies—Fayette, no doubt, had deeply reflected upon this subject, and felt it his duty, to save, if possible, the federative principle; knowing its value, perhaps, from sad experience of the consolidated principles in unlimited governments, better than any other person in the world; calls the attention of the President to its preservation, in the following most impressive, and appropriate language :

“ Yet, gratifications still higher awaited me in the wonders of creation and improvement that have met my enchanted eye ; in the unparalleled, and self-felt happiness of the people, in their rapid prosperity and insured security, public and private, in a practice of good order, the appendage of true freedom, and a national good sense, the final arbiter of all difficulties—I have had proudly to recognize a result of the republican principles for which we have fought, and a glorious demonstration to the most timid and prejudiced mind, of the superiority over degrading aristocracy or despotism, of popular institutions founded on the *plain rights of man, and where the local rights of every section are preserved under a constitutional bond of Union*. The cherishing of that union between the states, as it has been the farewell entreaty of our great paternal Washington, and will ever have the dying prayer of every American Patriot, so it has become the sacred pledge of the emancipation of the world.”—Fayette had doubtlessly seen the President's inaugural address. It was not possible that its general spirit and tenor should have escaped his discerning eye. He doubtlessly was struck with the sublimated political views of the President, the glitter, and splendor he had thrown over the American government ; but these seemed not to possess any charms whatever for Fayette. Far from being enamoured with these glittering scenes of governmental splendor, and governmental grandeur, portrayed by our President ; and far

from complimenting him upon them in his farewell reply, he in the most parental, affecting manner, reminds the President of the blessings derived from the principles of the American government, "founded upon the plain rights of man." He reminds the President of Washington's parental warnings in his Farwell Address. He most impressively presents to his contemplation the great federative principle, and declares, that it had become "the sacred pledge of the emancipation of the world!!" Was it possible to have paid a higher compliment to the federative principle, than to have proclaimed it "the sacred pledge of the emancipation of the world!?" Will not the American people give some attention to the solemn warnings of Washington and Fayette? Even if it were possible to suppose that the American people had lost all love of liberty, all love for American institutions, will they not give some attention to this recent solemn, impressive warning of Lafayette, against the rejection of the federative principle? Fayette, who, forty years before, had freely spilt his blood, and spent his treasure, for the establishment of the American liberties, in his farewell reply, declared to you that the federative principle has become "the sacred pledge of the emancipation of the world." Mr. Speaker, we have often witnessed a providential interposition in favor of American liberties. Can you not discern something like another providential interposition in sending Fayette, the apostle of liberty, to this country forty years after he had so essentially contributed to American independence, and that after his surveying with a discerning, parental eye, the political condition of the country, in taking his last leave of it forever, it should have occurred to him to warn the present generation, as Washington had done the former one, against the destruction of the federative principle? Permit me, sir, humble as I am, in this last effort, standing literally upon the brink of the grave, to unite my entreaties with Washington's and Fayette's for the preservation of the federative principle. For, trust me, sir, when I assure you, that it is my most solemn conviction, that nothing but the federative principle, in full and efficient energy, securing all their rights to the States, can save American liberty, "With it we are freemen—without it, we are slaves!"

VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE.

SUBSTANCE

OF

MR. GILES'S SPEECH,

IN REPLY

TO GENERAL TAYLOR,

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES,

MARCH 2, 1827.



MR. SPEAKER:

I FIND myself, most unexpectedly, before you again, sir, in the attitude of a speaker. When I reached the top of the stone platform, at your front door, I had no expectation, whatever, of entering again into this debate:—I came to the House, this morning, to vote, not to speak; but on arriving here, being assured by many of my friends, that some reply, to the gentleman from Norfolk, however general, was expected from me, and could not be dispensed with; I resolved, to yield to what, I was thus informed, was the general expectation. I frankly acknowledge, too, sir; that I felt disposed myself, to reply to some of the most prominent remarks of that honorable gentleman, which, I cannot avoid saying; excited my utmost astonishment. But I had indulged a hope; that this summary sketch, could be accomplished within half an hour. I could not reconcile it to myself, to occupy more of your time, sir, after I had, most reluctantly, already consumed so much; and after the indefatigable gentleman from Norfolk, had consumed, so much more. It will readily be perceived, sir, that it would not be possible, in the space of half an hour, to reply to the whole of a most eloquent, and voluble speech, of five days duration. I shall, therefore, limit myself to a very few points of a general character. One of the first, which most excited my astonishment, both in the matter, and manner of it, was, the charge brought against me, of supporting “Godwinian principles.”—Permit me, to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the principles, which I have actually supported. What are the principles contained in the preamble, and resolutions, which are thrown back on me, in terms of contemptuous obloquy? “Godwinian principles:” The principles, I have supported, and now retorted, under the sarcastic term of “Godwinian principles,” are nothing more, or less, than the principles of American fundamental laws.—Fundamental laws; introduced, and supported in their original letter, tenor, and spirit;—quoted;—designedly quoted, in the original

words. When these laws, are sported with ;—treated with contemptuous disrespect ;—with taunting ridicule,—branded with nicknames, as they seem to me to be, on this, as on many other occasions, can you fail to discern something alarming to all the written fundamental institutions of this country ? Can you fail to see, sir ; that all veneration, all decent respect for them, are gone ? And whilst you contemplate, and must deprecate their loss ; can you fail to remember, the political blessings, which have been diffused, by a wise practical dispensation of these contained Godwinian principles, amongst the American people, for the first five and twenty years, after their adoption ; and since the substitution of the improved, fashionable administrative principles, can you fail to see, distrust, alarm, impoverishment, and ruin overspreading the land ? And, sir, under what circumstances has this sad reverse, in our political experimental results, taken place ? In the midst of the most profound peace—both at home, and abroad.—If ever there were truly halcyon days, for the United States, they occurred at the very moment, seized upon by our infatuated rulers, to substitute principles of despotism, for principles of freedom. Nor has any thing since happened, to change this auspicious, happy scene ; except the unwise, delusive schemes for usurping ungranted powers to the General Government ? and the miserable, immoral, mistaken schemes, for increasing the wealth of the nation, by acts of most notorious injustice, between different sections of the country, and different individuals ; taking from one, the proceeds of his labor, and giving them, to another ? Great, and certain indeed, should be the increased wealth of the nation, from these unprincipled, trafficking schemes, to justify this outrage, upon the political morals, and the political justice of the government !!!

Why has it been, sir, that during five and twenty years of great difficulties, and embarrassments from abroad, unexampled political blessings have been showered down upon the people of the United States ? Confidence, happiness, content, and prosperity, reigning every where ; and now, when all is peace, and quiet, both at home, and abroad ; distrust, alarm, discontent and impoverishment, have overspread the land ? There is no difficulty in the solution of the problem. During the first period, our rulers, were content, to reign, within the sphere, allotted to them by the written institutions of their country,—To administer the constitution upon the federative principle. To leave the states, their rights unimpaired. During the last period, our rulers, have disregarded the provisions of the written constitution ; have destroyed the federative principle ; and usurped the rights, both of the states and individuals—and, sir, what are the principles, so triumphantly proclaimed by the learned, and eloquent gentleman, as the beloved substitutes for these despised “Godwinian principles ?”—In other words, American written fundamental laws ? They are principles of unlimited governmental powers. They are principles, which go to obliterate all the written restraints against governmental usurpations, contained in your fundamental laws : to break down all the sacred sanctuaries, erected by our forefathers, for

the preservation of the rights, and liberties of the American people. They are principles, which go to surrender all private property, into the hands of the government; to give to government an absolute control over the persons, and occupations of individual man; and to convert him, from a moral being, endowed with rights from his God, into a mere governmental machine, stripped of all rights.—In short, they are principles, of ultra despotism.—Do you not conceive, sir, this a most unfortunate triumph! and instead of the gentleman's rejoicing at, ought he not rather to lament over, the success of the General Government, in this substitution of principles, which he seems to glory in contributing to support?

Mr. Speaker; in the event of the introduction of a consolidated despotism in the United States, it will, indeed, be ultra despotism, in its essence. No despotism can go beyond it.—It ought to be most deeply impressed upon our minds; before we sanction this most hazardous change; that our written constitution affords us, our only safe-guards, for our rights, and liberties. Give up these; we have no other security left.

Not so with the old, long established governments of Europe.—For there, although their governments, are in theory, sovereign, and unlimited; yet in practice, there are customs, and habits coeval with the governments themselves, which afford their subjects, in the practical administration of the government, important securities in many respects. Here, sir, we have not this advantage, of customs and habits.—Spunge the written constitution, and we are perfectly at the will of the reigning dynasty, unpalsied by the will of constituents; or any thing else whatever;—subject, too, to the capricious will of a dynasty quite green; and whose undeserved elevation, would, of itself, utterly unfit it for the purpose of founding a wise, free, and beneficial government.

But, sir, perhaps the learned gentleman, may attempt to protect himself against this charge of contemptuous disrespect to our fundamental laws, according to my understanding of the gentleman's remarks, by making the application of the term “Godwinian principles” to the principles of free trade, which I have also most earnestly advocated. Will that be a sufficient justification for the use of this sarcastic appellation? Are the principles of free trade, “Godwinian principles?” What would give Mr. Godwin, the exclusive right to the principles of free trade? Are they not the principles of every enlightened, intelligent merchant, in both Europe and America? Are they not the principles of every liberal, intelligent political economist, in every country? Are they not the principles of every enlightened man, of every enlightened philosopher in the world? Are they not the best means of enlightening benighted man; and extending human liberty over the world? And from whence did arise, the beloved restrictive system? It took its rise in times of Gothic darkness, ignorance, and barbarism.—And who are now found to be its only advocates? Despots; and their advocates, and supporters. The legitimates of the world, who delight in the oppressions of the many; and in the gratifications of the few. Legitimates, who see,

or think they see, their own security, only, in this inequality, and despotism; dealt out by them, amongst the rest of mankind. Dealt out, as essential to the preservation, and security of their own legitimacy.

Such, sir, are the lauded, and beloved restrictive principles, triumphantly contrasted, and recommended by the learned gentleman, in preference to the modern, liberal principles, which, if the application be to them, he contemptuously brands, with the taunting epithet? of "Godwinian principles." But, sir, I understand the term, "Godwinian principles," as intended to apply both to American principles, and the principles of free trade.

These general hints, must suffice for the present, to point to the impression on my mind, of wonder, and astonishment, at this undeserved imputation, thrown against our fundamental laws, and all the liberal principles of this enlightened period of the world. Sir; I was deprived of the pleasure of hearing all the gentleman's eloquent harangue, of five days duration; but, sir; from what, I did hear myself, and from information derived from others, I do believe; that the ingenious, and learned gentleman, has introduced arguments, almost by the dozen; through each of which, if just, every restrictive provision in the written constitution, would be either utterly obliterated, or rendered completely unavailing. The very short time, allowed to myself, will prevent me from making a minute examination of each of these ingenious devices; I must, therefore, content myself with applying to them, a few general principles.

Amongst the ingenious devices adopted by the gentleman, is one, by which he derives a distinct, original, substantive power, not mentioned in the constitution; from another power, of the same description, which is mentioned in the constitution. Now, I think it self evident; if any one power not enumerated, can justly be deduced by this process of reasoning, any other power, not enumerated, can be deduced, by applying to it, the same process of reasoning. If so, then the government possesses all power. There being none, which may not be obtained by a similar process of reasoning—of course, the government must be unlimited. This, is the necessary result of the learned gentleman's demonstrations, and proves the charge, brought against the administration and its supporters, of their claims to unlimited powers. But whilst these demonstrations prove the government to possess all power, or can get all power at pleasure; its advocates still pretend, that they are administering a government, of limited powers. Now, sir, I earnestly call upon the gentleman himself, and all his associates in this mode of interpreting the constitution; I boldly challenge them; I plumply defy them; admitting, that this process of reasoning, for acquiring powers to the government, to be correct, to fix any intelligible limits of their own, against the acquisition of any power whatever, by the practical government. I peremptorily challenge them to show, any intelligible demarcations, to the limits of the power, of the general government, which shall definitely and intelligibly say;—"thus far thou shall go, and no farther."

But, sir, the learned, and eloquent gentleman, has laid down one principle, for the acquisition of power, which is to me entirely new ; and certainly entitles him to the first honors, amongst his ingenious competitors, in discoveries of devices for the acquisition of powers, to the general government. This new device demands a more minute, and critical examination. The learned gentleman has resorted to the war power, as containing a grant of all power. The power to make internal improvements, he asserts to be clearly deducible from the power to make war.—His process of ratiocination, I understand, to be this: the power to make war, includes all the powers, which furnish the necessary means for conducting the war, to the best advantage. The power to make a road, or canal, is often necessary, to approach, or avoid an enemy:—the power, therefore, to make a road, or canal, is necessary, to carry the war power most advantageously into effect. The same reasoning will extend to all internal improvements whatever. Consequently ; the power to make war, includes the power to make internal improvements in time of war, and, as the constitutional powers of the government are always the same ;—the same in peace, as in war ; it follows of necessity ; that the government possesses the power to make internal improvements in time of peace ; as well as, in time of war. This must be deemed an extremely important accession to the devices for destroying, all the written restraints in the constitution, upon the powers of the practical government, and leaving it perfectly unlimited ; and the gentleman, certainly, has borne off the palm, from all his competitors in the fashionable occupation, of discovering devices for converting a limited, into an unlimited government. For, according to the attenuated process of the learned gentleman's ratiocination, nothing would be necessary to acquire any power to the general government, under the express power "to declare war;" than to suppose the power wanted, might possibly be necessary to some military operation, in time of war ; when the same power, would necessarily attach to the government, in time of peace. Now, as there is no power, but in some supposed contingency, might be deemed beneficial, to some military operation ; in time of war, therefore, every power whatever, may legitimately be exercised by the practical government, both in times of peace, and war.

The argument being admitted, the government is unlimited in its powers—notwithstanding the gentleman's acknowledged celebrity, both as a municipal, lawyer, and civil jurist; I think, he is utterly mistaken in the source of the derivation of powers, under the war power—I readily admit, the constitutional powers of the general government, to be precisely the same, in time of peace, as in time of war ; but I peremptorily deny, that the power to make internal improvements is an accessorial power, to the power to make war ; and I also peremptorily deny, that when, in time of war, a road, or canal is made, with a view to military operations ; that it can legitimately be done, solely in consequence, of the express power to make war. The power is never legitimate, in time of war ; but when it is rendered so, by necessity. It is therefore the result of necessity ; not

of any expression in the constitution. It is grounded upon a principle of self-defence, which is above all law—paramount the constitution itself. But then, the necessity must be imposed; and that too, by the act of another; before the right can accrue.

The government has no more right to make a road, or a canal in time of war, than in time of peace, unless a necessity for the measure is imposed upon the government, by the act of the enemy—A state of war, is a state of force; not of law. “*Inter arma silent leges;*” and all the extraordinary powers, exerted in time of war, are the results of coercion—of force—of necessity.—The extremely ingenious, and learned jurist, seems to have forgotten, or never to have thought, that, when he was deriving the power to make internal improvements, from the war power: he was proving too much. For, from the same process of reasoning, he could prove, that the government in time of peace, possessed the power to make internal destruction—Yes: to make internal destruction of pre-existing internal improvements. This is as much a war power, as the power of making internal improvements; and is practised one hundred times, in time of war, where, the power to make internal improvements, is practised once. A state of war is not well suited, to making internal improvements—Hence, according to the very ingenious gentleman’s attenuated process of ratiocination, the general government, would have a right in time of peace, to batter down the city of Richmond, for the purpose of preparing to battle the enemy to advantage, in the event of war, and the presence of the enemy before the city. This right of the destruction of internal improvements in time of war, was several times carried into effect during our last war. A rope-walk, at Baltimore was burnt, by order of the American General; and sundry houses at Plattsburg, destroyed, and other acts of destruction committed. The principle upon which it was done, was self-defence; arising from the necessity imposed, by the presence of the enemy. This destruction was afterwards paid for; but it was admitted by all, that the government was under no legal obligation to do so, having merely acted in self-defence, and under a necessity imposed. The reimbursement in value, was made from equitable, and liberal considerations on the part of the government. Upon this point I speak with certainty, as I reported the bills, for reimbursements; and sustained them, by argument, in favor of the individual sufferers. Here the gentleman must see; that, if his favorite power to make internal improvements, in time of peace, be deducible from the war power, he must give with it, the power to make internal destruction of the internal improvements, when made; and I presume, he will then admit, that he has rendered the general government unlimited, in all times, both in times of peace and war; and in short, through all the moods and tenses of ultra despotism—Permit me here, sir, incidentally to remark; that the learned gentleman, tauntingly reminded me of passing over the discussion of the constitutionality of the power to make internal improvements—I stated my reason at the time, to be; that I considered that usurpation at an end—at least suspended in its operation.—That its impracticability had been demonstrated, without the accompaniment of com-

plete jurisdiction, over territory, within the limits of the respective States; and that, I did not believe; that one State in the Union, would surrender that jurisdiction to the general government. The subject was not therefore pressing; whereas, the other branch of the subject was; and was, moreover, in itself, too comprehensive, to be thoroughly examined in a single speech.—If the States should surrender their jurisdiction over the territory, persons, and things within their respective limits, the last vestige of their sovereignty, is gone—This jurisdiction is the only sheet anchor of their sovereignty—of their existence. Whilst the gentleman, is so precise in deriving all powers from the war power, he, nevertheless, cannot admit, that the embargo, and non-intercourse laws, were bottomed upon the war power, but upon the power to regulate commerce; and the gentleman has attempted to ridicule an argument, under the appellation of, “a Yankee argument,” which went to prove, that the power to regulate commerce, excluded the power to destroy commerce. The gentleman complimented the argument, as extremely ingenious; and the only objection he had to it, was; that it was totally destitute of “common sense.”—Now, sir; I must beg leave to differ totally with the learned gentleman, in the real characteristics of this “Yankee argument”—totis viribus.—I think, it consists, very little of ingenuity, and almost all of common sense. I heartily concurred in this “Yankee argument,” at the time, and it has not yet lost, any of its convincing influence upon me. The argument is; that the power to regulate commerce, excludes the power, to destroy commerce. I think the position self-evident:—Because it is self-evident; that no power can exist to regulate that; which has no existence in itself;—I think, the position so replete with common sense; that the dogma of the learned gentleman excited my utter surprise; and but for the very high respect, I sincerely entertain for the gentleman’s talents, I should be almost tempted to say; that the opposite position, for which he contends, is common nonsense. Suppose there had been introduced into the constitution, a written clause, to the precise effect, of the power claimed by implication—to wit—“Congress shall have power, to put down, destroy, and annihilate commerce”—Does the gentleman believe; that it would have met with a single advocate in the United States?—Suppose an amendment, now, were proposed to the constitution, to the same effect; does the gentleman believe, that it would now meet with a single advocate? Would the gentleman vote for such an amendment himself? Would not such a proposition, be deemed by all, the proposition of a blockhead, or a madman? Yet the learned gentleman, in his rage for deriving power to the general government, through his refined process of ratiocination, would not hesitate, even through the triumph of ridicule, to imply a power for the general government, which he would blush to vote for himself, if presented to him in written terms, directly for that purpose.

But the gentleman cannot admit; that the embargo, and non-intercourse laws, were bottomed upon the war power.—He most earnestly, and perseveringly insists; that they were bottomed upon the

power to regulate commerce; and to demonstrate, that they could not be deduced from the war power, asserts; that the first embargo, and non-intercourse laws, preceded the war; and consequently, could not grow out of war rights—"a non sequitur." The gentleman observed, that war did not exist between two nations, until every man, woman, and child, of one nation were, at least impliedly, armed, against every man, woman, and child of the other belligerent nation. This is war complete—War de facto—Flagrante bello—In extenso.—But the gentleman should recollect; that war rights generally, precede war acts; and the measures of embargo, and non-intercourse, grow out of war rights, antecedent to war acts, on the part of the United States. I have pressed the gentleman to say; when war rights do accrue to an aggrieved nation? But I cannot prevail on him to meet the question. Certainly, when one nation commits belligerent acts towards another, the aggrieved nation becomes instantly invested with all war rights, against the belligerent aggressor. Hence, when Great Britain, and France, commenced their belligerent acts against the United States, all the rights of war, instantly accrued to the United States, against both aggressing nations. The United States had a right instantly to consult their own interests, their own policy, in relation to the aggressors.—They were perfectly at liberty, to resort to flagrant war, or mitigated war, or bear the injuries inflicted on them. In pursuance of these rights, the United States determined, in the first instance, to resort to a mitigated state of war; and did so, through embargo and non-intercourse regulations—being, in fact, a commercial war, instead of an open war at arms. I never understood, nor heard, to the best of my recollection, until 1823 or 1824, "when all old things were done away, and all things became new"—that the embargo and non-intercourse laws, were considered as regulations of commerce, but a mitigated warfare against the aggressing nations. Indeed, they were almost unanimously so declared, in effect, by the House of Representatives. That House declared a determined resistance against the belligerent aggressors; and that resistance was afterwards made to consist of commercial restrictions, until the open war of arms, of 1812;—I knew of no other resistance; nor do I recollect ever to have heard, until 1823 or 1824, the fatal period of the civil revolution in our fundamental institutions, that the protection to certain domestic manufactures, which incidentally accrued in the ordinary course of raising revenue, was ever pretended to have grown out of the power to regulate commerce—I always understood it to have accrued out of the specified power to lay and collect "imposts;" and that, too, exclusively for revenue objects:—a power, if honestly exerted, extremely different from the power to protect manufactures, without any limitation; and through that power, to intermeddle with, and control all the occupations of society. Hence, the learned and eloquent gentleman seems to me to have misconceived the whole of both these branches of the subject.

The gentleman strenuously denies, that Great Britain has abandoned her restrictive system; and to prove his position, has exhibited a long catalogue of excessively high duties imposed upon foreign

goods, on their importation into Great Britain. I have never heard it asserted, that Great Britain had actually repealed all her restrictive laws. Such a measure would be impracticable, without the utter derangement of all the occupations of society; but the fact, which I assert, is; that the British nation and government have denounced the principles of the restrictive system, as unwise in theory, and infinitely destructive in practice; and, as far as practicable, in the present state of things, have endeavored to abandon it in practice. Particularly is this the case, with the corn laws, the corner stone of the whole system. These once universally admired laws, are found to be as mischievous in their operations, as they are unsound in principle. Through their operations, the poor operative is obliged to pay double the price for his bread, at which it could be furnished in foreign markets. Hence, destruction to the manufacturing occupations; and ruin, pauperism, and starvation, to the poor operatives employed in manufacturing establishments.—Hence, two hundred and eighty thousand persons, hold all the property in the British empire; and twenty millions two hundred thousand are stripped of all property—a great proportion of them, both of food and raiment. This is the effect, mainly, of the long continued system of monopoly. Is this a desirable condition for any population under the sun? Should a policy be introduced here, which will inevitably reduce the population of the United States to that condition? And, sir, with these awful and melancholy results before our eyes, is it not wonderful; when Great Britain, from sad experience, is endeavoring to free herself from the mischiefs of this despotic monopolizing system, that the United States should eagerly seize upon the discarded policy, and incorporate it into their system? heretofore founded in competition, in freedom, in justice, and equality?

But when this view of the subject is pressed upon the gentleman, he denies that this deplorable condition of the British population has been brought about by the restrictive system, but by other causes. Perhaps it may be so, in part; but he must admit, that the restrictive system has had no agency in counteracting this state of things, since it exists with the restrictive system; and therefore ought not to be resorted to as the means of counteraction.—No! it has not counteracted it; but most certainly contributed to produce it.

Mr. Speaker; I find myself, exhausting too much of the little time, allotted me, in examining the honorable, and learned gentleman's, principles; and must therefore proceed at once, to the examination of his precedents—These seem to be his chief reliance.—He could not fail to see; that his principles were merely colorable, even in his own eyes; that they wanted something to invigorate, and give them fresh color; and precedents are resorted to for that purpose. Indeed; I have never known a case, in which so many precedents, have been invoked; and so incessantly, and perseveringly repeated as in the present case, when, as far as I am able to comprehend, there is not a single case produced, which possesses the common, and essential properties of a precedent. The gentleman is a most learned and practised lawyer; and of course, must delight in precedents.—But he should recollect;

that whilst precedents are binding on courts, they are not on legislatures, particularly are they not in the interpretation of the constitution. The constitution is a written instrument, is always the same, and at all times, as much open to the interpretation of one legislature, as another. If any laws, passed by a preceding, should be found, by a subsequent legislature, to violate the provisions of the constitution, so far from being binding, it would furnish the best reason for the repeal of the unconstitutional act. Courts are bound by precedents; and the gentleman's forensic habits, would necessarily incline him to rely much upon them, and when, in a bad cause, he is so fortunate, as to find some one, even of remote resemblance, he delights in it, and coupling it with his own ingenuity, he confidently relies upon their joint influence, as a sure guarantee, of ultimate success. So in the present case, questionable, in his own estimation, in principle, he has been extremely prolific, in the production of precedents—But give the gentleman all the weight of precedents, in this case, which they would be entitled to in a court of law, and, as far as I am able to judge, he has not produced a single case, with all the essential requisites of a precedent. Even in courts of law, the gentleman must admit that to entitle a decision, to the weight of precedent, the question upon which it was made, must have been brought directly before the court, and its merits solemnly argued, and decided; and moreover, it ought to receive the sanction of an unanimous opinion, or certainly, of more than a majority of the court.—Still, after all—it is subject to be reversed by the same court—Decisions, "subsilentio;" and "obiter sayings," can never be dignified with the appellation of precedents:—the last solemn, decision too, forms the precedent. Has a single case of the many, produced by the gentleman, possessed these essential requisites, or conformed to these rules? Certainly not—They are all acts passed "subsilentio"—and "obiter sayings," or general expressions—mostly intended for other objects, and not having the smallest resemblance to, the case under consideration. This is surely the case, with all the acts, imputed to Washington, Jefferson, and Madison. The gentleman has not produced a single case, in which the direct question of the constitutionality of the power to make internal improvements was ever brought before either of these presidents, and solemnly decided by either of them in its favor. But so far from it, Jefferson, and Madison, on several interesting occasions, have recommended an amendment to the constitution, to obtain, in a qualified form, that very power, which the gentleman contends, they have determined the general government now possess in an unqualified form; and these high authorities are now relied upon as affording precedents for that purpose. The very requisition for an amendment to the constitution, made by these authorities, is the best precedent, to prove, that the general government did not, according to their judgments, antecedently possess that power. For, if they deemed an amendment essential to the acquisition of the power at one time, it was equally so, at any other time; and ought completely, to exclude all these far-fetched inferences, drawn from acts, having other objects, and bearings in view, to prove their determinations in direct opposition to their own deliberate decisions, upon the point, when directly in question before them. But, Mr. Speaker,

whilst I am not allowed time, to examine each individual case, brought forward, as a precedent ; and to show, that not one of them possesses the common properties of a precedent, as applicable to the case under consideration, I feel myself called upon to trespass upon so much of your time, as will enable me to give to one of them, a more critical examination. This is the celebrated case of the Cumberland road, which has been hawked about, as a case in point, in most of the public prints—Yes, the law establishing the Cumberland road, has so frequently, and so triumphantly been brought forward, as a precedent, directly in point, that it has been generally believed to be so ; whereas, it is wanting in almost every property of a precedent. This statement has been so often repeated, and so generally believed, that the public seem determined, not to be convinced of their error, by the most positive contradictions, supported by the most authentic documents. The public seem to be so much enamoured of this bold misrepresentation, that they prefer to give it credence, though proved to be false ; to its contradiction, though proved, to be true. Yes, sir, in this extraordinary case, falsehood seems to have more charms, for the public ear, than truth. I will notwithstanding these discouraging circumstances, give the true history of the boasted precedent of the Cumberland road, founded upon authentic documents—and it will be found as destitute of the essential requisitions of a precedent, as any one of the subordinate cases, brought forward in its support—The gentleman asserts, that this law was sanctioned both by Jefferson and Madison ; and he has been pleased, not in his usual spirit of urbanity, to honor me with the appellation of the father of the Cumberland road. I think, that after the gentleman shall give his attention to its true history, he will admit, that he has mistaken the appellation he has bestowed upon me ; and that the nearest affinity he can make out between us, will be its grand-father—for, by recurrence to the Journals of the Senate, it will appear, that I was not present in the Senate, at the time of its passage, nor at any time during the progress of the bill.

The following are the Journals of the Senate, from the first introduction, to the final passage of the bill.

Thursday, December 5, 1805.

The Senate took into consideration the motion made yesterday, for the appointment of a committee, to examine the “act to enable the people of the eastern division of the territory north west of the river Ohio, to form a constitution and state government, and for the admission of such state into the Union, on an equal footing with the original states, and for other purposes.”—And

Thursday, December 19, 1805.

Mr. Tracy, also, from the committee last mentioned, reported, a bill, “to regulate the laying out and making a road from Cumberland, in the state of Maryland, to the state of Ohio ;” and the bill was read ;

Ordered, That it pass to the second reading.

Friday, December 20, 1805.

The bill, “to regulate the laying out, and making a road from Cum-

berland, in the state of Maryland, to the state of Ohio," was read a second time ; and on motion,

Ordered, That the further consideration of this, be the order of the day for Monday next.

Thursday, December 24, 1805.

The bill, "to regulate the laying out, and making a road from Cumberland, in the state of Maryland, to the state of Ohio," was considered as in committee of the whole ; and being reported to the House without amendment ;

Ordered, That this bill be passed to the third reading.

December 27, 1805.

The bill, "to regulate the laying out, and making a road from Cumberland, in the state of Maryland, to the state of Ohio," was read the third time, and the blanks having been filled,

Resolved, That this bill pass, that it be engrossed, and that the title thereof, be "an act to regulate the laying out and making a road from Cumberland, in the state of Maryland, to the state of Ohio."

Ordered, That the secretary desire the concurrence of the House of Representatives in this bill.

From these Journals it will be seen, that the Cumberland road bill, was introduced ; went, through its several stages, and finally passed, with as little ceremony, and consideration, as any bill ever did pass that body. That, after the admission of Ohio into the Union, it was considered as a matter of course, and that no constitutional question, which might have grown out of it, ever was moved in the Senate. It therefore, may be said, to have passed "sub silentio;" of course, it cannot form a precedent—But, says the learned gentleman, with his usual forensic ingenuity, that the Journals of the Senate, showing no division in opinion upon the bill—no yeas, and nays, having been called for at any stage of it, are not conclusive evidence, that the constitutional question was not moved, debated, and solemnly decided. It is admitted that the evidence is not positively conclusive, but is, as strongly presumptive, as evidence can be ; that no such question ever was moved—The yeas and nays, were not only not taken, but the bill appears never to have been postponed for argument. There is one postponement seen in the formal parts of the proceedings, but not for argument—This suggestion, therefore, can only be considered as a new stratagem of the ingenious gentleman, to shift the burthen of the proof from himself, to myself. He triumphantly presents the Cumberland road law, as a conclusive precedent in his favor ; and of course, places himself under the obligation to show, that it has all the properties of a precedent—that it is complete to all the intents, and purposes of a precedent directly in point ; but when he finds it has not one of these properties, he then calls for negative proof. I now ask the honorable gentleman, whether this comports with his usual candor ? Does he not know, that there was no such debate, with almost as much certainty, as if it had been so entered in the Journals of the Senate ? If such debate had taken place, would it have been possible

to have eluded the public prints of the day! and if it had been inserted in them, would not the gentleman have produced them here, to prop up his deficient precedent? Surely he would. I now call upon the gentleman; and put it to him to say, whether, or not, he ever saw, or heard of such debate. If it had taken place, is it possible to conceive that his indefatigable researches would not have found it out? But the Cumberland road law cannot be deemed a precedent in this case, for another reason—the principle upon which it is founded, is at this day, thought by many, not to involve in any degree, the question of the power of the general government to make internal improvements, but is an exception to the general rule; and depends, for its own peculiar justification, upon its own peculiar circumstances. It is, at this day, therefore, a fair matter for difference in opinion. I am well informed, that this was Mr. Jefferson's most deliberate opinion till a short time before his death. The gentleman is not willing however, to exempt me entirely from his charge, of having been the father of the Cumberland road bill, although I was not present at any stage of it, till its passage. He asserts; that it grew out of a report, I had the honor to make, for the admission of the state of Ohio into the Union. That there was a condition in that report, which went to pledge a certain portion of the proceeds of the sales, of the public lands, within Ohio, towards opening roads, through the public lands within that state, with an extension of such roads, through the Atlantic states to the city of Washington. I think it not improbable myself, but that the Cumberland road bill, did grow out of the report referred to by the indefatigable gentleman, and yet, I cannot think I was in the remotest degree, entitled to the appellation of the "father of the Cumberland road."

The report presented a mere initiatory condition, in an arrangement, for the admission of Ohio into the Union. This was done in 1802, four years, before, even the introduction of the Cumberland Road bill.—There is too little relation between this initiatory process, and the final adoption of another measure; although possibly growing out of it, and the distance of time is too great, to connect me, in any way, with the Cumberland Road law. It is perfectly uncertain, if I had been present, whether I should have voted for the Cumberland Road bill, or not. If no constitutional objection had occurred, I probably should; but most certainly, I should not, if the constitutional question, respecting the power to make internal improvements, had been moved; and believed to have been applicable to the provisions of that bill. But the gentleman informs us; he has been for several months searching my speeches; for detections of inconsistencies, in my opinions, at different periods of my political life;—the gentleman no doubt, had anticipated a rich, and delicious mental banquet upon my reported inconsistencies. He seems, however, not to have spread a very rich repast before this house; but even if the gentleman, had been much more fortunate, in his researches, than he seems to have been, I can assure him, it would have been labor in vain.—I have never aspired to the perfectibility of absolute consistency; under all circumstances; and in every period of my life. I readily acknowledge I have often committed errors; and if the gentleman had been so fortunate, as to have presented me with an error, I should instantly have acknowledged it without hesitation.

I have heretofore done so, on other occasions, a memorable one, in reference to some measures of Washington's administration.—I always mean to avail myself of experience, and reflection; and whenever they admonish me of an error, I will take pleasure in avowing it. All the pledge I ever make, is, that of good intention—I yield to none in that respect—I pledge myself, that whenever called upon to express an opinion, or give a vote; that I express that opinion, or give that vote, which results from the honest conviction of my best judgment, *at the moment of performing either act*; perfectly regardless, of what my opinion, or vote may have been, upon the same subject, at any former time. But, Mr. Speaker, what seems to have been the success of the indefatigable gentleman, in his laborious researches in quest of my inconsistencies? The gentleman, in a style, and manner, more rough, than could have been expected from his accustomed urbanity, has produced an entire speech, which he has attributed to me; and which, from his peculiar ebullition of feeling upon the occasion, he does seem to think, really contains some opinions inconsistent with those expressed by me in this debate. This imputed speech, is a miserable scrawl of some note taker, who has taken it with great carelessness, to say the least of it; and for whose most inaccurate version, I do not consider myself responsible in any respect whatever.—Whilst I thoroughly disclaim its language, as never having been pronounced by me, I am yet willing to admit its general tenor; not so much out of respect to the verity of the note taker; as because, it appears to be, such as probably was employed by me, on the occasion.—This most imperfect scrawl, ~~too~~, is brought forth, by some silly sycophantic parasite, and printed by the officious, mistaken, editors of the *National Intelligencer*, in one column, contrasted with another, pointing out my misconceived inconsistencies, to the hand of the deluded, delighted gentleman.—Notwithstanding all these researches and troubles, there is no more relation, either of contrast, or resemblance, between the contents of the two columns, than there is, between the contents of either, and the contents of the Lord's Prayer. Permit me here, sir, to introduce the formidable scrawl at large. I can, however, but regret the waste of time in doing so. Whilst introducing it, I protest against it, as not having the least resemblance to the speech actually delivered by me.—In its interpretation, however, it ought to be taken in reference to its context.—The subject in discussion was, the admission of a new state (Ohio) into the Union. One of the conditions of such proposed admission was; to apply a certain portion of the proceeds of the public lands, towards making a road from the Atlantic states, to unite with the roads, proposed to be run through the lands belonging to the United States, within the state of Ohio, when the following proceedings are stated, by the note taker, to have taken place:

Extract from the Proceedings, and Debates in the House of Representatives, on the 31st of March, 1802.

“ On a report of a select committee respecting the admission of the Northwestern Territory, as a state, into the Union. Mr. Griswold moved to strike out the 3d article, which provides, that one-tenth part of the net proceeds of the sales of western lands, should be applied to the making of roads, leading from the navigable waters, emptying into

the Atlantic, to the Ohio, and continued afterwards through the State of _____." Mr. Giles, in opposition, said, "he was sorry there was any part of the report, that had a local aspect; but this was unavoidable.—Local considerations were often necessarily blended with principles of general utility. He recollects the passage of several bills for the erection of light-houses, though he did not recollect how many of these were raised at the public expense on the Connecticut shores. Considering them as useful, though they had a local effect, he had always voted for them. He would also mention certain circumstances attending the aiding of the fisheries to the Eastward, to which certain benefits were attached, that were derived from the contributions of other parts of the Union; yet he had always voted for them, notwithstanding their local application. So far as relates to Virginia, the simple effect of this resolution will be, to form a road over a mountainous country. Mr. G. said he was himself as little interested, as the gentleman from Connecticut; yet, where measures were devised, whose great object was the general benefit, though they might be attended with local advantages, he had no objection to them. He believed the state of Maryland, the Federal City, Alexandria, Baltimore, and Philadelphia, would be most benefitted by facilitating an interchange of commodities." I presume it will be readily admitted, that no constitutional question, is included within this part of the discussion; but a mere question of locality; when I contended, that local benefits, growing out of the measures intended for the general good, ought not to form an objection to them; provided the general good would be promoted by them; and that every measure of the description of the one under consideration, ~~must have~~ an effect, more or less locally, ~~beneficial~~—a sentiment, which I now avow; and which I have already avowed, perhaps, half a dozen times, during this session of the General Assembly. This scrawl proceeds, partly in italics. "Mr. G. said, he considered the circumstances of connecting the different parts of the Union, by every tie, as well of liberal policy, as of facility of communication, highly desirable. He further believed, that the devoting one-tenth of the proceeds of the lands, to the laying out new roads, would be, in fact no relinquishment on the part of the United States, as the lands would thereby be greatly enhanced in value. *If, however, it shall be thought, that this sum will be better applied in the opening roads, in the interior of the state, he shall have no objection to that.*"

Is there any constitutional question involved in these remarks? Certainly none.—It is the mere expression of an opinion in favor of good roads, which is not at all abated at the present moment; but it must surely be understood to be such roads, as were to be made by the proper constitutional tribunal, and within constitutional provisions. Is there here seen, even a hint from any quarter, that the proposed road was unconstitutional? Is any constitutional question whatever, here made, or even intimated? Certainly none.—It here seems, too, from the concluding remark, that I was perfectly careless about the provision for the extension of the roads into the Atlantic states, and was perfectly willing, that the whole fund should be applied to opening roads within the state of Ohio. The scrawl proceeds:

"The gentleman from Connecticut, (Mr. Griswold,) affects lately

to have discovered a great deal of disguise in the proceedings of this House. What disguise? What were the committee to do? This country is placed in a certain peculiar situation. *We* have waters running to the East—*they* to the West; and the committee thought it was desirable to connect these by good roads. *With the committee, State principles or interest had no influence; they were governed entirely by general principles, and the common interest.*"

Here, sir, is again seen, in the most crude conceptions, and language, a farther enforcement of the first suggestion, that the general interests operated with the committee, regardless of local interests or prejudices. But, sir, here is an expression which called forth the most animated effusions of triumph and pleasantry on the part of the learned jurist, whilst it could not fail to excite both my smiles and my surprise.—I was astonished, that instead of the delight which seemed to be enjoyed by the gentleman, from the novel, enchanting sound; that he did not involuntarily feel its harsh grating upon his own ears.—The expression was perfectly new to me; and its sound most coarsely grated upon my ears. I am satisfied I never heard the sound, until I heard it, in all the joy of triumph, from the enchanted gentleman's lips; nor saw it, in print, until I saw it in this heterogeneous scrawl. "State principles"—This term has occupied much of the gentleman's time; and afforded him a delicious treat for commentary. Now, I would ask the gentleman, if he ever before heard, or saw the term, "State principles?" If so, what ideas did it convey to his enlightened mind? Has he attempted a definition of the term? If not, I would now most reverently ask him to define it. What is the meaning of the term, "State principles?" Is it susceptible of definition? I have often before heard of "State rights," but never of "State principles." "State rights" are susceptible of the clearest definition. They mean the rights reserved to the states by all our fundamental laws. "State principles" are indefinable—They are too numerous, and too various for definition. I protest against the imputation of having used that term—strike it out, and the sentence stands in perfect accordance with the rest. Now, sir, I would ask the delighted, learned jurist, if upon this review, he is not astonished himself, at having dwelt so long, with so much apparent exultation, upon a term, so totally destitute of meaning, and insusceptible of definition? and whether he has not discovered, that, in his most unprofitable researches, he has permitted his passions and his prejudices to cast some light tinge of obscurity over his own brilliant understanding?

The scrawl proceeds:—"The gentleman has also insinuated, that the Secretary of the Treasury holds lands that will be benefitted by these roads. It may be so. Mr. G. had not inquired; but he supposed he did not hold all the lands. Congress may lay out these roads as they please. He could not foresee how Congress would lay them out, and it is a million to one, that they will not touch his lands.

"The United States are about making a new contract. These propositions are made as additional securities for the national property. The Secretary of the Treasury, having estimated the annual

product of these lands at 400,000 dollars, Mr. G. said, as Chairman of the committee, he had applied to him to know his opinion of the manner in which the sum could be best secured; and he gave his opinion, that this provision would be most likely to effect that object. This is all the mystery and disguise attending the resolution."

Thus terminates this careless, incorrect scrawl.—It here appears, that the United States had large, and complicated interests, within Ohio, which required to be secured, upon its admission into the Union, on the footing of an original state; and that subject being intrusted to me, I had taken the precaution to consult Mr. Gallatin, then Secretary of the Treasury, as to the best mode of securing these interests to the United States, and had been entirely successful in effecting the important object. For the gentleman has been liberal enough to admit, that not only these, but all the public interests confided to my hands, during an active service of above twenty years; have been fortunately secured, and promoted; and I assure the learned gentleman, that I derive more consolation, from this admission, united with my own consciousness of the fact, than would overbalance all the mortification that could have arisen, if he had been much more successful in his laborious researches after my inconsistencies, than his meagre developements here, prove him to have been. For, I would put it to the candor of the honorable gentleman himself, and to every honorable member, after reviewing his exhibitions, to say, whether there remains the shadow of a shade of inconsistency to be seen, in any part of my conduct or opinions? and, if any should still labor under such delusion, to ask himself, where that inconsistency can be found? But, whilst this careless, incoherent sketch, of my remarks, exhibits no vestige of inconsistency on my part, it does serve to prove, incontestably, one fact, extremely important in this discussion—that upon the report made for the admission of Ohio into the Union, the question of the constitutionality of the extension of the roads from the interior of Ohio to the Atlantic waters, was never made, nor discussed, nor considered; and of course, proves as incontestably, that the law for the establishment of the Cumberland Road, can form no semblance of a precedent for the power to make internal improvements; and consequently, can afford no justification whatever, for the usurpation of that power by the general government.—The absence of all intimation whatever, of the unconstitutionality of the Cumberland Road law, in the debate, arising out of the Report of 1802—and also, of the bill of 1806—is a conclusive negative proof, that no such question ever was made; and therefore, no semblance of precedent can be founded upon it. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask you, sir, what has become of this formidable battery of precedents, with which we have been loudly, and vauntingly threatened, to justify the exercise of the power to make internal improvements? The precedents exist not; nor did they ever exist.—They have been conjured up, by an officious disturbed imagination, in consequence of the total defeat of the arguments derived from a fair interpretation of the constitution, upon principle. The precedents brought forward, have been of two kinds—adjudged cases, and the

obiter sayings, in general declarations of individuals. As it regards the first, it is proved, that not a case produced possesses the common properties of a precedent; and how does the case stand in regard to the general obiter declarations of the individuals, relied on by the learned gentleman, as the judges who pronounced these obiter declarations? As it regards President Washington, it appears that during his administration, no question was ever made, as to the unqualified powers of the general government to make internal improvements; and as to his recommendation of certain specified points of internal improvements, it does not appear, that any of them had ever been formally argued, upon the question of constitutionality, directly brought before him: and of course, could not have received such solemn adjudication by him, as would give them the properties of precedents. They were mere general declarations, not solemn decisions. In regard to President Jefferson, it will appear from some of the cases produced, and from others, which might be produced, that, when the constitutionality of the power to make internal improvements, was directly brought before him for his opinion, he recommended an amendment to the constitution for giving that power for certain objects, and in a limited form, which recommendation certainly amounts to a positive and direct incompatibility with the opinion of the pre-existence of that power in the general government.— Besides, no case has been, nor can be produced, in which, after solemn argument, nor even without it, he ever did express an opinion, that the general government did possess the power to make internal improvements in any form. Certainly not in an unqualified form.— Independently of all these considerations, in relation to Mr. Jefferson, it is well known to his friends, that he died in a state of “the deepest affliction,” from the most firm conviction, that the usurpation on the part of the general government, of the power to make internal improvements, united with the power of controlling the occupations of individuals, and distributing the whole proceeds of the labor of society amongst its individual members, had effectually obliterated all the restraining provisions of our fundamental laws; and would necessarily be followed by the substitution of the most frightful, consolidated despotism. Surely, the gentleman must be hard pressed for precedents, when he introduces a judge with these opinions and feelings, in direct hostility to the principle for which he is quoted, as the author of his precedent.—Strange to tell! Mr. Madison is also called upon as another judge, pronouncing solemn opinions, and thus affording precedents in favor of the power of the general government to make internal improvements; when it is well known, that one of the last acts of his political life, was, the rejection of a bill passed by Congress, including that power; and expressly because it did include that power!—Thus, for the sake of saving this great principle from usurpation, incurring the highest responsibility a President can incur; and under a full knowledge that it was to be one of the last acts of his political life.—Yes! sir, that his future political fame would mainly depend upon it. Sir, *for this act*, of sterling devotion to the constitution of his country, and to the security of the liberties

of his countrymen, and of the hopes of the liberties of the whole human race, combined with the protection he afforded to the freedom of religion; when inadvertently assailed by Congress, Mr. Madison has most justly entitled himself to the love, admiration, and veneration of the present generation; and if American liberties should thereby be preserved, in the preservation of the restraining provisions of our fundamental laws, Mr. Madison will then, not only have entitled himself to, but will certainly receive, the most grateful remembrance and admiration of applauding posterity.

Under these circumstances, the last adjudication, forming the precedent, is it not more than strange! is it not wonderful! that Mr. Madison should be invoked, as the author of precedents for establishing a principle, directly opposite to the one, for the preservation of which, he put to hazard all his own political fame, and incurred the highest responsibility attached to his high station!!—Mr. Speaker, humble as I am, sir, I have been honored by the indefatigable gentleman, as having afforded another precedent, in favor of his principles. Yes, sir, pressed, coarsely pressed by the gentleman upon that point, loudly calling to his aid the *argumentum ad hominem*.—He still insists, that I am the father of the Cumberland Road law; and that, that law furnishes a precedent in point—in favor of the power of the general government to make internal improvements at its discretion; when upon examination, it is seen, that the law itself contains no such general principle, and that if it did, it was passed *sub-silentio*, without argument—without consideration—and consequently, without affording any precedent whatever; and so far as relates to myself, it also appears, that I had no agency whatever in passing that law. Nor has the gentleman, with all his indefatigable researches into my speeches, of above twenty years, been able to exhibit the smallest inconsistency whatever in my interpretation of the constitution; but that through the whole course of my political life, I have been invariably governed by the great rule of construction in the interpretation of the constitution, which is applied to the construction of all written instruments; and without which, written instruments would be without all certainty of meaning. That is, so to construe the constitution as to give every part of it its proper efficiency, and not seize upon one clause, for the purpose of destroying, and annihilating all the rest. Sir, the gentleman has totally failed to show, that I ever expressed any opinion whatever, at any period of my life, in favor of the power of the general government to make internal improvements. Nor did I ever entertain, or express such opinion, to the best of my recollection:—but if I had, sir, it no longer exists.—I have given to this subject the most attentive consideration—I have exhausted the best faculties of my mind in deliberating upon it—and I am most decidedly of opinion, that the general government possesses no such power; and if it did, that it would, in its operations, necessarily subvert all our fundamental laws.—That the power to make internal improvements, united with the power of applying all the resources of the country, at the will of the government, and controlling all the occupations of society, would constitute the most frightful consolidated despotism. Let me then, pray you, sir, not to de-

rive a scintilla of influence in favor of the frightful, despotic doctrine, from any opinion ever entertained by me. I here now stand before you, and solemnly protest against being used as affording a precedent in favor of doctrines so repugnant to the soundest dictates of my head, and so abhorrent to the best feelings of my heart. Let us now suppose, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman were before a court, what a farcical figure would he make, sir, when amidst his vast budget of precedents, he fails to produce a single adjudicated case in favor of his principles; and when those persons whom he has relied upon, as the judges pronouncing in favor of his principles, have denounced them with alarm and abhorrence; and when one of them stands before you, sir, and begs, and prays you, sir, not to sanction the gentleman's doctrines; when he now, firmly and solemnly avers, that after bestowing the best exertions of his mind upon the subject, he conscientiously believes, that these doctrines are destructive of all the efficient provisions of our fundamental laws, and must necessarily cause to be substituted, an unlimited, for a limited government.

I believe, sir, I have already exceeded the limit of time, allowed for making this reply, and would now gladly take my leave of the gentleman's principles, and precedents, and of the debate forever, but, sir, the honorable gentleman introduced one point, upon which, he seemed to dwell, with triumphant delight, and which cannot be passed over without some animadversion. It was a point, which excited my extreme surprise, and deep mortification. It was the triumphant joy, expressed by the gentleman, at his anticipation of the downfall of Virginian principles, of Virginian influence, and of Virginian ~~institutions~~; and in his ebullitions of delight, from these ~~institutions~~, he placed the Virginian people and ~~governmen~~, as I think, in the most depressed, degraded, and ~~undeserved~~ condition. I must acknowledge, sir, I was hurt, mortified, and surprised, at seeing a high-minded, honorable Virginian, rioting in the pleasure of his anticipating the downfall of Virginian principles. I thought sir, that some little commiseration, some little regret, would be felt by every one, at a final parting with old friends, who had stood steadfastly by us, in times of the utmost need.—Yes sir, from the recollection of the great blessings these old friends, these Virginian principles have dispensed, not only amongst the Virginians, but amongst the whole American people, so long as they were permitted to govern their destinies. Nor could I bring myself to believe, sir, that this feeling could be utterly lost, even in the most sanguine anticipation of greater blessings, from the principles proposed to be substituted.

Sir, what are the Virginian principles, proposed to be degraded and abandoned? and what are the principles, proposed to be substituted in their stead? Virginia principles are universal—they apply to all parts of the United States. They are as much the principles of Maine, and Louisiana, as of Virginia. They seek not to take from one section, nor one individual, and give to another, but to render every one his due, wherever he may be found. Virginian principles, sir, are founded in morals, in justice, in nature; and are derived from nature's God. The principles proposed in their stead, are founded in artifice, in huckstering, and trafficking, grounded upon sectional interests and

individual rights—They are utterly destitute of morals, and of justice. Indeed, they are essentially grounded in injustice; they consist of tricks, and contrivances, by which one description of individuals, takes to itself, under the sanction of law, the proceeds of the labor of others; and the more it can get, the greater the injustice, and of course, the greater the merit of the law—Injustice, not justice, constituting the merit of the law. Yes, sir, the principle is recommended, not for its justice, but for its injustice. This extraordinary trick, in these artificial, fashionable principles, proves at once, their peculiar vice, and forbids all favorable anticipations from their practical operations. Yet such is the character of the gentleman's lauded substitutes, for discarded Virginian principles, and for these principles, he delusively calculates upon increasing the blessings of the American people. Sir, I deeply regret the necessity I am under, of recollecting, and reviewing, the triumphant joy displayed by the gentleman in describing the fallen condition of his own State, in regard to her prosperity and happiness, as well as in regard to her policy; whilst I enjoy the triumphant pleasure of believing the gentleman to be utterly mistaken. It is true; that Virginia's wealth, and prosperity, have met with every check and discouragement, which the worst policy of the general government could impose; it is true, that a portion of her wealth is drawn from her, and expended in other parts of the United States; but, sir, her citizens still have enough for their comfortable subsistence; whilst her social condition is the best in the world. In no country in the world, is the law more absolute and ~~sovereign~~, nor justice more impartially administered generally, nor ~~so~~ cheaply, to the poor; whilst her moral principles have become proverbial. But, ~~says~~ the honorable gentleman, her population is not increasing, in the same ratio ~~with~~, that of other states, her representation in Congress is lessening, and her moral influence in the general government is gone. Is there any thing strange in the first position! Is not the emigration from Virginia a natural consequence of the immeasurable tracts of fertile lands, recently opened to the West, and the South? Did not every reflecting man of common sense, anticipate precisely the present state of things, from natural, independently of political causes? But, sir, this is no evidence, that the moral influence of Virginian principles is lessening in Congress. Directly the opposite effect is produced by this state of emigration—Emigrating Virginians, are not lost Virginians—They took their Virginian principles with them, and they have learned their value, by a comparison of them with the principles of the states respectively, in which they now reside. When they appear in Congress, from their new residence, they bring back their Virginian principles with them; more endeared to them, from a conviction of their superior excellence, and thus extend their influence, in a greater degree than could have been done, if they had remained in Virginia, and been her own representatives. Yes, sir, Virginian emigrants become more enamored with Virginian principles after their removal, than many of those who remain within Virginia's bosom, and derive their nourishment from its parental, bountiful supplies. Sir, Virginian principles never stood in higher admiration at Washington, than they do at this moment. It is true, they are out voted for the moment—It is true, other principles are con-

structed with them, and substituted for them, for the moment; but, sir, in the very act of this snbstitution, the highest admiration is felt, and expressed for Virginians and Virginian principles. I am told sir, that nothing is more common amongst the trafficking schemers themselves, when they have an unprincipled bargain in view, than to remark, it is in vain to apply to a Virginian with your trafficking proposition; he will tell you at once, that it is destitute of principle; and that he never can condescend to advance the interest of his state, at the expense of Virginian principles. Can any thing be more honorable to Virginians, and Virginian principles, than this honorable testimonial avowed by their opponents? and ought we not to feel a pride in our successive representatives, whose honorable conduct has called forth this high tribute of respect, even from their adversaries? No, sir, Virginian principles are not down, although out voted for the moment by a mistaken policy; nor can they ever be down, so long as they retain their pristine merits, and are supported by Virginians themselves. If Virginians desert their own principles; if they join in the unnatural outcry against them, then will Virginian principles be down indeed, and then indeed, will Virginians see, and feel their own degradation.

But sir, this is the moment for comparing the relative merits of the two systems, by their practical results; and of course, the moment of the triumph of Virginian principles is approaching, and must shortly arrive—Let us then, persevere in our own principles; let us never cease to contrast their merits, with the demerits of the schemes of their opponents. Let us proclaim them upon the house top, that they may be seen by the whole American people, and their triumph must be just as certain, as that virtue will triumph over vice; when left to fair combat—force, or fraud, or both combined, can alone give vice the victory over virtue.—Mr. Speaker, at what moment is it sir, that this spirit of gloom, of despondency, is called forth, and attempted to be diffused, throughout the Virginia people. It is sir, at a moment, when the unprincipled contrivances, substituted for Virginian principles, are crumbling into atoms, and falling to pieces about the heads of their mistaken, deluded projectors. It is, sir, when these contrivances are rapidly introducing alarm, distrust, hostility, and opposition. And if left to themselves, after doing incalculable mischief, must necessarily eventuate in self-destruction. These natural, and necessary results too, are seen amidst peace and quiet, at home, and abroad; whilst Virginian principles secured perfect confidence, amidst the aggressions and wars, from the most powerful nations of Europe.—Sir, the ardent, and indefatigable gentleman, has not failed most strenuously, to urge you to take counsels of your fears, upon the present occasion.—He has threatened us with disunion, and civil war; for daring to investigate our rights under the very words of our fundamental laws. Is it come to this, sir? that a state government, shall not dare to inquire into its relative rights, with the general government; still less, not to resort to practical constitutional means, for protecting these rights against the usurpations of the general government, without being charged with treasonable designs against the Union; and threatened with arms, for thus daring to do

itself justice? Sir, this attempt at alarm, is not new in Virginia. It has before been practised upon two most memorable occasions.

In 1775, when Virginia consisted of not more than 200,000 souls, she was threatened with the myrmidons of the most powerful nation in the world—Her sovereigns, and her masters—then armed “cap-a-pee,”—and in battle array, upon her coasts;—Yes sir, even within her territory—a frightful odds!!! But sir, what was the conduct of our gallant fore-fathers upon this awful and terrific occasion? amidst this great impending danger? Did they yield to threats, Sir? Did they take counsels of their fears? No sir; They determined on resistance—they nobly determined to preserve their liberty, or to die.—“Liberty, or death,” was then the order of the day; and when in the general assembly, the fears of the members were addressed—threatened with the mighty power actually impending over them—Patrick Henry, with a God-like eloquence, unequalled in ancient and modern times; after scoffing at the unmanly attempts at alarm, with an elevation of soul and of voice, most eloquently attuned to nature, cried out—“Let them come!!! I say,—let them come!!!” They did come; we met them in combat,—and we were free.—In 1798-1799--under much more discouraging circumstances than the present, Virginia was again threatened for daring to assert her rights.—For daring to resist the alien and sedition laws. Her representatives on this floor, were threatened with arms;—with incarceration—Did they then meanly, and timidly yield to these alarms? No sir! They determined again, to regain their rights, or perish in the attempt—They then went earnestly and systematically to work—The first measure they then adopted, was, to pass a law, to protect them in the freedom of debate; requiring the State Judges, in the event of any member, being imprisoned for words used in debate, to issue a writ of habeas corpus; and to replace the incarcerated member in his place, on this floor.* They then determined to arm the militia, and to make provision to purchase 5,000 stands of arms.—Then it was sir, that the foundation for the regular supply of arms to the militia was laid, in the establishment of your armory.—To defray the expenses of these measures, they* raised the whole taxes of the State 25 per cent, with a single scrape of the pen.—Backed by these measures, they entered a solemn protest against the offensive laws. These were measures truly worthy of Virginia.

Did they eventuate in war? in disunion? No sir. They saved the Union—they saved the nation.—These measures regained our liberties; and once more, we were free.—These measures well deserved success; and they were successful.

Now, Sir, in 1827, not thirty years having elapsed. Before one generation had passed away—another crisis has occurred. It has been produced by measures, as bad in principle as the alien and sedition laws; and incalculably more injurious in their practical operations—every moment drawing from us our substance, and degrading us with tribute—Now are we told that inquiry will not be tolerated; and that opposition, yes, constitutional opposition, will sound

* See the Act, at the end.

the tocsin of disunion and war. Believe me sir, it is not inquiry—it is not opposition, which has produced this alarming crisis, leading to disunion and war; it is the intrinsic vice of the operative measures actually adopted. This alarming crisis, is the natural effect of unprincipled measures. Such measures are the common causes, which produce such effects:—Could any other effects have been expected, from seizing without reason, and without right, the wealth of one section of the country, and sending it to another? producing impoverishment in one section, and prosperity in another? From seizing the property of one man, and giving it to another? Is it possible to devise measures, better calculated to produce resistance and abhorrence? You can but see, sir, that the true cause of the apprehended disunion and war, is mistaken. It is not seen in a negative opposition to affirmative measures; but in the practical necessary operations of the affirmative measures themselves. The contrary false impression, is attempted to be made by the ingenious schemers themselves, to turn the awful responsibility for the mischief they have done, from themselves, to their adversaries. But sir, a mere negative opposition, without some equivalent cause, never did, nor ever can produce a crisis, like the present—This ingenious diversion, never can succeed. The real authors of these operative measures must be known; and must suffer all the responsibilities, due to their own mischievous evil deeds. The gentleman, in his indefatigable zeal to paralyze the proceedings of this House; and to effect a quiescent submission to a disgraceful tribute, has, I am told, pledged himself to this House, that Mr. Jefferson, at the time of his lamented death, was decidedly opposed to the proposed proceedings.—I know sir, that the honorable gentleman is incapable of intentional misrepresentation; but, I also know sir, that he is utterly mistaken, in the pledge he has given the house.—I know, that Mr. Jefferson has seen “with the deepest affliction,” the measures, which have produced the present crisis; and I also know, his recommendations to the States, would be to enter, and to keep up, solemn protests, against these usurpations, as the mildest incipient measures, suited to the deprecat-ed occasion—with a view to more efficient ulterior measures, in the event of a continued perseverance in these usurpations.

For these facts, I pledge my integrity and veracity to the House; and that I have the evidence of them, under Mr. Jefferson's own hand writing.* No sir. Mr. Jefferson was not opposed to the measures now proposed to be adopted—He was most decidedly, and unequivocally in favor of them. No man knew better than Mr. Jefferson, the deplorable consequences of sponging the written constitution. No man viewed them with deeper affliction; and no man was more willing to oppose them; by the mildest means, in the beginning; by the strongest, in the end; if, most unfortunately, the strongest should become necessary. But submission, never; No! submission would be his last alternative: and then, only by compulsion. Mr. Jefferson well knew, that in the beautiful theory of our complicated system of governments, the State governments were placed as centinels, over

* See Mr. Jefferson's letter, page 152.

the rights of their citizens respectively; with powers sufficient to guard them against the usurpations of the general government.

The time is come, which most imperiously calls upon every state government, to perform the solemn trust; and shall the Virginia government, treacherously shrink from the performance of it? No, sir, it is not possible. This general assembly will be found steadfast at its post; and will fearlessly perform this high and honorable trust—a trust, conferred by the constitution, which every member is sworn to support.

Mr. Speaker, what is the object to be effected in the performance of this most sacred trust? It is to keep the various departments of our complicated governments within their legitimate, appropriate spheres.—It is to ward off the encroachments of the general government, from the rights of the states and of individuals. And what, sir, was the great object of Washington's farewell address? It was the same thing—It was to keep each department within its proper sphere—It was to avoid trenching upon sectional interests—It was to guard against setting the north against the south, and the east against the west. What was the great polar star which guided the administrations of Washington, of Jefferson, and of Madison? It was a virtuous adherence to the written constitution.—It was keeping within the sphere of their legitimate constitutional powers. It was leaving to the states and state governments, all their legitimate constitutional powers.—Their virtuous self-denial was the true secret of the success of their administrations.

Will you indulge me, Mr. Speaker, with again reminding you, sir, of the last impressive warning of Fayette? It was, to preserve the federative principle—It was, to adhere to the great American principle, of “the plain rights of man.” He most feelingly declared, it was under its potent, beneficent operations, that every political blessing had been showered down upon the people of these United States. It was to shun the glitter, the splendor, and the grandeur of governments, such as were brilliantly portrayed in the President's inaugural address. Yes, sir, Fayette called your attention, most emphatically, not only to the rights of man, but to “the *plain* rights of man;” most evidently, in contrast with the President's splendid, glittering government. For no man knew so well as Fayette, from most awful experience and sufferings, that the splendor of governments, was the slavery of man. And, most impressively, did Fayette tell you, sir, that the great American federative principle, is not only the surest guarantee for American liberties, but “the sacred pledge for the emancipation of the world.”

Permit me, sir, to add my solemn warnings to those of these great apostles of liberty, against the surrender of state rights—against the fatal abandonment of the federative principle.

Sir, I am done. I have faithfully presented my most deliberate views of this momentous subject. I most fervently thank my God for the physical power he has given me upon this great occasion.—I most cordially thank him for strength, both of mind and body, to enable me conscientiously to perform my duty. I have now conscien-

tiously performed it; and I have perfect confidence, that every honorable member of this House, will, in the vote he is now called upon to give, conscientiously perform his duty.

TO THE PUBLIC.

Mr. Jefferson's Letter, and Mr. Clay's "great desideratum in Political Economy."

Extract from Mr. Clay's Speech upon the Tariff Bill of 1824.

Page 12.

"The great desideratum in political economy is the same as in private pursuits; that is, what is the *best application of the aggregate industry of the nation* that can be made honestly to produce the *largest sum of national wealth*. *Labor is the source of all wealth, but it is not natural labor only.*" Judging from Mr. C.'s prize speech, generally, and from the five foregoing lines particularly;—indeed, from all his speeches, and it would seem that Mr. Clay knows about as much of the "great desideratum of political economy," as he does about the Delphic oracles, or of the occult art of alchymy, or of the illusory coruscations of the brilliant prospect of the Panama Congress, or of the inexplicable intricacies of the West India Trade. It would also seem from the subjoined letter: that Mr. Jefferson is here directly at points with Mr. C., respecting his great political, polar star—"the great desideratum in political economy;" and that his "deepest affliction," at the deplorable crisis, most unwisely brought upon our country, was not produced by *his terrific alarms* "at the election of a military chieftain" to the Presidency, but from much more substantial, and fearful considerations. From the unprincipled usurpations of the practical government. From converting a limited, federative government, into an unlimited, consolidated one. In substance, from the five lines quoted above; and the inevitable consequences from the practical operations of their contents, in obliterating all our fundamental laws. This letter was not originally intended for publication, but I now feel myself impelled to give it publicity, from the following considerations amongst others: The extract contains the whole of the political part of the letter; some parts, merely private, are omitted. The part respecting the University has been published, as giving Mr. Jefferson's views of the then actual condition, and future prospects of this important institution, which may be attended with public utility; and also, as a refutation of one falsehood, out of many, which have been circulated through the press, for the last ten years, in relation to myself, to wit: That there was an unfriendly feeling existing, between Mr. Jefferson and myself. The falsehood is destitute of all pretext whatever. For some time past, some of the Administration prints, desperate in their utmost need, have attempted to avail their bad cause of the just influence of Mr. Jefferson's well earned political fame,

by solemn assurances to the public, that Mr. Jefferson, when living, was in favor of the measures of the Administration; and of the re-election of Mr. Adams. For this purpose, they have lavishly poured forth eulogiums upon Mr. Jefferson, for opinions, which they have ascribed to him, and which, if living, I verily believe, he would consider his greatest reproach. They have at length gone so far, as to put expressions into Mr. Jefferson's mouth, under marks of quotation, with intimations that they can be proved by competent evidence, (nothing doubting,) whilst they are not only altogether surreptitious, but in direct hostility with the undeviating tenor, and spirit of Mr. Jefferson's whole political life, and with his declarations, both verbally, and in writing, often frankly, and openly made to his friends, as I am well informed, 'till within a short period before his lamented death. Under these circumstances, it appears to me to have become the duty of every friend of Mr. Jefferson, and of his country, who may be in possession of any written declarations from him, serving to demonstrate his real opinions respecting the perilous crisis of the country, to lay them before the public, and thus, at once, to put down the surreptitious ones. This course alone can serve to rescue Mr. Jefferson's unsullied republican fame from the false, and unmerited aspersions brought against it, under the guise of affected plaudits, the most delusive, and deceptive. Besides, I conceive under these gross attempts at deception, the public has a right to demand a disclosure of all Mr. Jefferson's real opinions, in whosesoever hands they may be, as a protection against the mischievous influence of the spurious opinions, falsely ascribed to him; and that, too, as I believe, by his now most unnatural, loving friends, not long since, his most deadly foes. Two papers of this description, which have particularly attracted my attention, will be introduced here. The one, taken from the National Journal.—The devoted "coalition" paper, at least, so characterized. The other, from the Richmond Whig. This latter is ushered forth, by a writer, under the signature of "A Farmer," who, most charitably, charges his brother Farmers, and every body else, not acting under the same delusive influence with himself, with being "confiding dupes;" whereas, the scribbling Farmer seems, himself, to be the most "confiding dupe," that ever undertook to enlighten a people, by overcasting them with the thick mist, in which, he is himself enveloped. So much so, that he seems to be led about, by some "ignis fatuus," with syren songs, made up in doleful, pathetic strains, which he deals out to others, in the same fascinating, heart-rending melody. These characteristics will shine, with peculiar lustre, in the example here exhibited. Should this "confiding dupe" of a Farmer possess only a small portion of the candor of his calling, I think, after reading Mr. J's letter, containing his real opinions, and contrasting them with the surreptitious ones, which have served to "dupe" the confiding Farmer, he will at once acknowledge; that there is no occasion to ask, "who is the dupe?" He must stand, himself, "the dupe confessed." Doubtlessly, he will be surprised to be told, that he is as much the *unconscious "dupe,"* in many other of his delusive disclosures to the people. Having made

them, if he means to give the people fair play, it has become his duty, to hunt them up himself; and do his best, to undeceive his own "confiding dupes," should he have been so unfortunate as to have made any.

WILLIAM B. GILES.

[*Extract from the National Journal.*]

"One venerable authority, however, has been introduced in support of the claims of General Jackson, so imposing as to carry with it, if uncontradicted, great moral weight. We allude to that of the departed, and lamented Jefferson, who has been quoted, since the grave closed upon his mortal remains, on the ground of a volunteer sentiment, given by him at a Public Dinner, as being favorable to the election of General Jackson. To suit this purpose, the toast itself was garbled; but even thus garbled, meant nothing, but that General Jackson had earned, what he has justly received, as the reward of his services—the thanks of his country. Opposed to such construction, as has been put upon Mr. J's toast, we have in our possession, *conclusive testimony, that the sentiments, which we have expressed, on this subject, are those, which the illustrious Jefferson expressed;* but in stronger terms. *We have his dying words, so to speak; and we will close this article with them.* Of late years, *that venerable man, seldom ventured to say any thing on politics; but not many weeks before his death, he observed to a friend, "That his faith in the self government of the people had never been so completely shaken, as it had been, by the efforts made, at the last election, to place over their heads, one, who, in every station he ever filled, either military or civil, made it a point to violate every order, and instruction given him, and take his own arbitrary will, as the guide of his conduct."*

"In such terms, strong as they are, and much stronger, than we are disposed to use, *did Mr. Jefferson speak just before his death, of the alarm created in his mind, by the effort to place a merely military man, at the head of our Republic.*"

Extract from the Whig.

"*These were the signs, which called forth from that great apostle of freedom, Jefferson, his last but terrible warning: "My country!" said he, "thou too, will experience the fate, which has befallen every free government—thy liberties will be sacrificed to the glory of some military chieftain. I had fondly hoped, to have found in thee an exception; but thy support of Jackson—a man who has disregarded every order he received—who has trampled under foot the laws, and constitution of his country—and who has substituted his own ungovernable will as his own rule of conduct—thy support of such a man, shakes my confidence in the capacity of man for self-government, and I fear all is lost."* This is the language of the dying patriot. *And if we followed him with undiminished confidence, and with unex-*

amped success, in times and seasons, when liable to temptation, what deference is not due to his opinion when delivered under such solemn circumstances, and in a condition, little less imposing than if he had just risen from the dead! Under such high authority, I the more confidently assert, that the effort to elect Jackson, is the fruitful fountain of the prevailing mischiefs, which every sober man, must deprecate, as disturbing the repose, and threatening the safety of the Republic. This infirmity of a blind, and idolatrous devotion to military success—the bane of every republic, that has gone before us—is the prolific soil, whose harvest of bitterness, we are now reaping. In the phrensy it produces, reason is no longer heard. *The grossest falsehoods are propagated and believed—every object is sacrificed, without scruple to the success of the idol.*"

"MONTICELLO, DEC. 26, 1825.

"To W. B. GILES, Esq.

Extract.

"Dear Sir,—"I see as you do, and with the deepest affliction, the rapid strides, with which, the federal branch of our government, is advancing towards the usurpation of all the rights, reserved to the states, and the consolidation in itself, of all powers foreign and domestic; and that too, by constructions, which if legitimate, leave no limits to their power. Take together the decisions of the federal court, the doctrines of the President, and the misconstructions of the constitutional compact, acted on by the legislature of the federal branch, and it is but too evident that the three ruling branches of that department, are in combination, to strip their colleagues, the state authorities, of the powers reserved by them, and to exercise themselves, all functions, foreign and domestic. Under the power to regulate commerce, they assume indefinitely, that also over agriculture and manufactures; and call it regulation too; to take the earnings of one of these branches of industry, and that too, the most depressed, and put them into the pockets of the other, the most flourishing of all. Under the authority to establish post roads, they claim that of cutting down mountains for the construction of roads, of digging canals; and, aided by a little sophistry, on the words "general welfare," a right to do, not only the acts, to effect that, which are specifically enumerated, and permitted; but whatsoever, they shall think, or pretend, will be for the general welfare. And what is our resource for the preservation of the constitution? Reason, and argument? You might as well reason, and argue, with the marble columns encircling them. The Representatives, chosen by ourselves? They are joined in the combination; some from incorrect views of government; some from corrupt ones, sufficient, voting together, to outnumber the sound parts; and with majorities, of only 1, 2 or 3, bold enough, to go forward in defiance. *Are we then to stand to our arms?*"

[A few words are here omitted, relating merely to an individual.]

"No! that must be the last resource, not to be thought of until much longer, and greater sufferings. If every infraction of a com-

pact of so many parties, is to be resisted at once, as a dissolution of it, none can ever be formed, which would last one year. We must have patience, and long endurance then, with our brethren, while under delusion. Give them time for reflection, and experience of consequences; keep ourselves in a situation to profit by the chapter or accidents—and separate from our companions, only, when the sole alternatives left, are the dissolution of our union with them, or submission to a government without limitation of powers. Between these two evils, when we must make a choice, there can be no hesitation; but in the meanwhile, the states should be watchful to note every material usurpation on their rights—to denounce them as they occur in the most peremptory terms; to protest against them, as wrongs, to which, our present submission shall be considered, not as acknowledgments, or precedents of right; but, as a temporary yielding to the lesser evil—until their accumulation, shall outweigh that of separation. I would go still further, and give to the federal member, by regular amendment of the constitution, a right to make roads, and canals of intercommunication between the states—providing sufficiently against corrupt practices in Congress (log-rolling, &c.) by declaring that the federal proportion, of each state, of the monies so employed, shall be in works within the state, or elsewhere with its consent, and with a due salvo, of jurisdiction. This is the course, which, I think, safest, and best, as yet.

"You ask my opinion of the propriety of giving publicity to what is stated in your letter, as having past between Mr. John Q. Adams, and yourself. Of this, no one can judge but yourself. It is one of those questions, which belong to the forum of feeling. This alone, can decide on the degree of confidence, implied in the disclosure.—Whether, under no circumstances, it was to be communicable to others. It does not seem to be of that character, or at all to wear that aspect. They are historical facts, which belong to the present, as well as future time. I doubt, whether a single fact, known to the world, will carry as clear a conviction to it, of the correctness of our knowledge, of the treasonable views of the federal party of that day—as that disclosed by this, most nefarious, and daring attempt, to dissever the Union; of which, the Hartford Convention was a subsequent chapter; and both of these, having failed, consolidation becomes the first book of their history.—But this opens with a vast accession of strength, from their younger recruits, who having nothing in them, of the feelings, or principles of '76, now look to a single and splendid government of an Aristocracy, founded on banking institutions, and monied incorporations, under the guise, and cloak of their favored branches of manufactures, commerce and navigation, riding, and ruling over the plundered ploughman, and beggared yeomanry. This will be to them, a next best blessing, to the monarchy of their first aim—and, perhaps, the surest stepping stone to it."

[The foregoing includes the whole of the political part of the letter. Then follows some information, and remarks, purely private, and it thus concludes.]

"Our University has been most fortunate in the five professors,

procured from England; a finer selection could not have been made; besides their being of a grade of science, which has left little superior behind; the correctness of their moral character, their accommodating dispositions, and zeal for the prosperity of the Institution, leave us nothing more to wish. I verily believe, that as high a degree of education can now be obtained here, as in the country they left—and a finer set of youths, I never saw assembled for instruction; they committed some irregularities at first, until they learnt the lawful length of their tether, since which, it has never been transgressed in the smallest degree. A great proportion of them are severely devoted to study, and I fear not to say, that within 12 or 15 years from this time, a majority of the rulers of our state, will have been educated here. They shall carry hence, the correct principles of our day; and we may count assuredly, that they will exhibit their country, in a degree of sound respectability it has never known, either in our days, or those of our forefathers. I cannot live to see it—my joy must only be that of anticipation, but that you may see it in full fruition, is the probable consequence of the 20 years, I am ahead of you in time, and is the sincere prayer, of your affectionate, and constant friend,

THOMAS JEFFERSON."

The foregoing extract, containing the whole of the political part of the letter, is a true copy from Mr. Jefferson's original letter to me, written in his own hand-writing.

W. B. GILES.

I had intended to publish so much of the foregoing letter from Mr. Jefferson, as would serve to protect him against the unfounded imputation, brought against him, of being opposed to the proceedings of the General Assembly, and to redeem the pledge of my own integrity and veracity, given to the House, upon that occasion; whenever my speech in reply to General Taylor should be published.—Other unfounded imputations, being subsequently brought against Mr. Jefferson, I anticipated its publication, and extended it to the whole of the political part of that letter. This was done chiefly for the purpose of counteracting their deceptions upon the public, and of protecting Mr. Jefferson's political fame against gross misrepresentations of his political opinions. I conceived, that truth belonged to the public, and that the public had a right to demand it. That I was made the guardian of Mr. Jefferson's political fame, so far as his political opinions were entrusted to me in that letter, and that withholding it from the public, when his political fame was wantonly assailed, would be treachery to that sacred trust, after it had pleased God to remove him from this world, and thus to disqualify him from protecting himself. Besides, his son-in-law, Governor Randolph, viewing the subject in the same light with myself, had previously made a public statement of Mr. Jefferson's opinions, which had also been most wantonly assailed; and which, would be completely vindicated by the publication of Mr. Jefferson's letter.—These were additional inducements with me for anticipating the publication of the letter; and for publishing the whole, instead of a part of its political contents.

[The following are the Preamble and Resolutions, adopted by the General Assembly, and which formed the topic of this discussion.]

The committee, to whom was referred, on the 2d day of February, 1827, a resolution calling for an enquiry into certain points of fundamental law, and certain differing claims of jurisdiction between the Government of this State and that of the United States, have bestowed on that subject all the consideration which, in their judgment, its peculiar delicacy and importance demand; and beg leave to submit the following REPORT:

With respect to the first enquiry called for from the committee, to wit: "Whether or not the exclusive jurisdiction over all the territory, persons and things within the limits of this Commonwealth, was not secured to the Government of this State, by the Constitution thereof?" The committee beg leave to observe, that in the formation of the State Constitution, there are no grants of specified, designated powers from the governed, to the governors. The great natural rights of man are secured to the people by a Declaration of Rights, prefixed to the Constitution and deemed an essential part of it. Upon this Declaration of Rights, the practical principles and checks contained in the Constitution itself, and the relative rights of the governed and governors, founded in the reason and nature of things, the people of this Commonwealth depend for their protection against Governmental oppression. The Constitution, after ordaining and declaring the future form of government of Virginia to be as follows: and that "the Legislative, Executive and Judiciary departments shall be separate and distinct;" provides that "the Legislative shall be formed of two distinct branches, who, together, shall be a complete Legislature." The Executive and Judiciary are also made complete departments in themselves respectively, forming altogether one entire Government. The committee, therefore, report, that the exclusive jurisdiction over all the territory, persons and things within the limits of this Commonwealth, was vested in, and secured to the Government of this State by the Constitution thereof.

In regard to the second point of enquiry, to wit: "Whether private property was or was not, thereby, (by the Constitution,) secured to the owner, against the power of the Government; so far, at least, that the Government could not, rightfully, take private property from the owner, and give it to another person, neither rendering public service?" Your committee report, that the right of property being a natural right, and of course derived from a source paramount to all government, that principle is made applicable to the Government of this State, in the first section of the Bill of Rights, in the following words: "That all men are by nature equally free and independent, and have certain inherent rights, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity; namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness." In pursuance of this principle, the committee find the following provision in the fourth section of the Bill of Rights: "That no man, or set of men, are entitled to exclusive or separate emoluments or privileges from the community, but in consideration of public services." The same principle is also asserted in the amendments to the Constitution of the United

States, and in several of the State Constitutions, as will be seen in the further progress of this report. From these considerations, the committee express a confident opinion, that private property is secured to the owner by the State Constitution, in such a manner that the Government cannot, rightfully, take it from the owner and give it to another person, not rendering public service.

The next subject of enquiry the committee have examined with peculiar care and circumspection, to wit: "Whether or not any portion of the exclusive jurisdiction of the Government of this State over territory, persons and things, has since been granted to the General Government by the Constitution of the United States; and, if so, to specify particularly each and every portion of such jurisdiction, which may have been so granted." In regard to the exclusive jurisdiction which may have been granted to the General Government by the Constitution of the United States, upon the most careful review of that instrument, the committee can find no grant of exclusive jurisdiction over territory, made to the General Government by the States, as parties thereto, except the following: 8th section of the 1st article:—"To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such district, (not exceeding ten miles square,) as may, by cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of Government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the Legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings." With respect to "the transfer of exclusive jurisdiction by this State to the Government of the United States over persons and things within its limits;" the committee would observe, that there are certain specified powers granted to the General Government; and, that a jurisdiction over persons and things within the limits of this State, has also been granted to that Government, so far only, as is necessary to carry into effect those specified powers. But, the committee conceive this jurisdiction to be concurrent over the same persons and things, and not exclusive—the State jurisdiction applying to all purposes of general protection—the jurisdiction of the General Government applying only to the specified powers.

The committee, with like care and circumspection, have examined the next subject of enquiry: that is to say, "Whether any power has been granted to the General Government to violate the right of private property at its discretion; and, more particularly, to take private property from the owner, and give it to another person, neither rendering public service;" and report, with confidence, that no power whatever has been granted to the General Government to violate the right of private property at its discretion, nor to take private property from the owner, and give it to another person, not rendering public service. So far from it, that in addition to the guarantees herein before mentioned, for the protection of private property to the owner, the committee find the following solemn pledges in the amendments to the Constitution of the United States: Extract from article 5th. "No person shall, &c. be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation." Article 9th. "The enumeration in the Constitution of certain

rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained to the people." Article 10th. "The powers not delegated to the U. States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people." This principle of the security of property seems to have pervaded the fundamental laws of almost every State in the Union; and to have been expressly declared therein in some form or other, as will appear from the following extracts: From the Bill of Rights—New Hampshire. "All men have certain natural, essential and inherent rights—among which are, the enjoying, acquiring, possessing and protecting property." From the Declaration of Rights—Massachusetts. "All men are free and equal, and have certain natural, essential and unalienable rights: among which may be reckoned the right of enjoying and defending their lives and liberties; that of acquiring, possessing and protecting property," &c. And again, "No man, or corporation, or association of men, have any other title to obtain advantages, or particular and exclusive privileges, distinct from those of the community, than what arises from the consideration of services rendered to the public." From the Declaration of Rights—Vermont. After the like declaration as to the right of property, is the following: "That private property ought to be subservient to public uses when necessity requires it; nevertheless, when any person's property is taken for the use of the public, the owner ought to receive an equivalent in money." From the Declaration of Rights—Maryland: "That monopolies are odious, contrary to the spirit of a free government, and the principles of commerce, and ought not to be suffered." Other extracts, from the Constitutions of other States, to the same effect, might be here quoted, but the committee conceive the foregoing sufficient to shew the general spirit, for the security of property and for an equality of rights amongst individuals pervading as well the Constitution of the United States, as of the several States.

The following subject of enquiry, the committee deem highly important; and have, therefore, bestowed on it a corresponding consideration: "Whether the several laws passed by the General Government, for the purpose of internal improvements, do not assert or involve a jurisdiction over the territory within this Commonwealth, beyond the grants to that Government specified in the Constitution of the United States." The committee here feel constrained to observe that, upon a most careful review of the Constitution of the United States, they have not been able to find therein the term "internal improvements," nor any other equivalent term therefor. Nor have they been able to find the word "canals," at all, nor the word "roads," except as connected with the post-office department. The committee conceive that the power to make internal improvements is not only an original, substantive—but a primary, paramount power in itself, and not a derivative, incidental one. If this power be assumed by the General Government, as an original one, it must be assumed with all its own incidents accompanying it; and such assumption must be altogether independent of any grant, specified in the Constitution. If it should be assumed under the disguise of an incidental one, its own incidents must still accompany it. In either case, these consist in all the means necessary and proper for carrying it into effect. And the committee can conceive

of no means sufficient for that purpose, which will not assert and involve a jurisdiction over territory, as well as a right to the acquisition of private property. Neither canals nor roads can be made without an acquisition of a right to the soil over which they may respectively pass. This acquisition could not be had without a judicial proceeding, asserting and involving jurisdiction;—the only mode heretofore resorted to by the laws of this country, for condemning private property for public uses, being by writ of *ad quod damnum*. The exercise of such jurisdiction by the General Government, would not only destroy all the demarcations of power between the State and General Governments, grounded upon principles of locality, and generality; but would be consolidation in its essence. The assumption of the jurisdiction would be more necessary to enable it to carry into effect its assumed power to make internal improvements, because it is deprived of all the means pointed out by the Constitution for investing itself with jurisdiction over all its legitimate objects. These means will be found in the following provisions of the Constitution: “To exercise like authority over all places purchased, by the consent of the Legislature of the State in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings.” These include all the legitimate objects of territorial jurisdiction, granted to the General Government; and the committee express the opinion, that there are no other territorial objects, over which the General Government is legitimately authorised to exercise any jurisdiction whatsoever within the limits of the respective States,—unless the jurisdiction over the District of Columbia, and the Territories of the United States, should be considered as additional territorial objects—and the mode in which this jurisdiction is obtained, is particularly and specifically prescribed. This minute and particular description of objects, limited and unimportant in themselves, and the particularity of pointing out the means, by which jurisdiction over them should be obtained, are sufficient of themselves to preclude all inference, that the power to make internal improvements, so vastly more extensive and important in itself, was ever intended to be granted to the General Government. This conclusion is rendered still more irresistible, when it is observed, that no means are pointed out in the Constitution for transferring to the General Government the jurisdiction necessary for the effectuation of this substantive power. This conclusion is still further enforced by the consideration, that the term “internal improvements” is one in common and ordinary use—that the term “canals,” and the term “roads,” are simple and familiar; and all the terms susceptible of the clearest definition. No reason can then be assigned, why these powers were not granted to the General Government, had they been intended to have been granted; especially when the power to erect a house, relatively of so little consequence, was thought sufficient to justify a particular grant of power, with specified means of carrying it into effect. Besides all these considerations, the peculiar character of the power to make internal improvements, is locality—locality in its most limited form; and therefore peculiarly unsuited to the jurisdiction of the General Government, which is general in its character, and peculiarly suited to the jurisdiction of the State Governments, whose jurisdiction is intended for local objects. From

these considerations, and many others which might be adduced, the committee report ; that, in their opinion, the several laws passed by the General Government, for the purpose of internal improvements : such as the "Act to procure the necessary surveys, plans and estimates upon the subject of roads and canals," approved May 4th, 1824, and others, whether they involve a jurisdiction over the territory within this Commonwealth, or only appropriate money for the purpose of making internal improvements, are unauthorised by the grants of power to the General Government contained in the Constitution of the U. States.

The committee have bestowed the like consideration on the following enquiry : "whether the law, generally called the tariff law, does not violate the rights of private property, by taking it from its owner, and giving it to another person, neither rendering public service." Upon a most careful review of the Constitution of the United States, in the 8th sec. of the 1st art. the committee find an enumeration of certain specified powers granted to the Government of the United States. The first specification is in the following words : Art. 1st. Sec. 8. "The Congress shall have power: 1. To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States ; but all duties, imposts, and excises, shall be uniform throughout the United States." Then follow other specifications. But the committee do not find amongst them the specified power to protect manufactures. The term "protection of manufactures," is not to be found in the Constitution, nor even the word "manufactures" itself; nor any equivalent term for either. The enumerated powers contain all the powers which the people thought proper, by the Constitution, to grant to the General Government, "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity." All the unenumerated powers were reserved to the States respectively, or to the people for the same objects ; and so expressly declared to be in an amendment to the Constitution. This distribution of powers between the General and State Governments, was ordained and declared by the people, in their Constitution, to afford the best means for effecting the great ends of its formation. The power "to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises," furnishes the essential means for carrying all the other enumerated powers into effect. The object of granting this power is declared to be, "to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States," as restrained and limited by the specified powers. Hence, under this grant Congress would have power to lay and collect taxes, &c. for the purpose of paying "*the debts of the United States*," and for carrying into effect all the other enumerated powers. But Congress could derive no power from this grant whatsoever, to assume and to carry into effect any power whatever, not included amongst the enumerated powers. The power to protect manufactures not being included amongst the enumerated powers, Congress can therefore, derive no power whatever, from the grant to lay and collect taxes, &c. to protect manufactures. The protection of manufactures being an original, substantive ; indeed a primary, paramount power, cannot be assumed by Congress ; or, if

it can, then any other power whatever may be assumed at pleasure; because it is impossible to conceive upon what principle of right Congress could assume the power to protect manufactures, without assuming any other unenumerated power whatever at its own unlimited discretion. And, if Congress can assume any unenumerated power at its discretion, and also the means for carrying it into effect; then, are all the restraints imposed in the Constitution, upon the will of the General Government, unavailing; and that Government will become consolidated in its practice, and unlimited in its will. The protection of manufactures, being a power peculiarly local in its character, affords the strongest consideration to Congress against its assumption; because directly against the spirit of generality and equality, which pervades the whole Constitution; and which was indispeusible to its original existence. The force of this argument cannot be, in the smallest degree, diverted or evaded by the usual resort to the term "general welfare." That term contains no grant of power whatsoever, but was intended, and is, a restraint upon the pre-existing grant of power to lay and collect taxes, &c. The term is "the general welfare of the United States;" and the plain and obvious meaning is, to restrain Congress from laying taxes, &c. to provide for any other welfare than "*the general welfare of the United States;*" to restrain Congress from laying taxes, &c. to provide for the particular welfare of any particular State, or the local welfare of any particular part of any particular State. The Act of Congress, passed May 22, 1824, entitled, "an act to amend the several acts imposing duties on imports," generally called the tariff law, was passed for the avowed object of protecting domestic manufactures. The power to protect domestic manufactures, not being found in the enumerated powers in the Constitution, Congress can have no power to lay taxes for its effectuation. Congress having power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, have unquestionably the power to lay imposts upon all foreign goods, for the purpose of revenue; provided such revenue be applied to carrying into effect, all, or any of the enumerated powers. But, Congress have no power to lay imposts upon foreign goods, for the purpose of protecting domestic manufactures; because the protection of manufactures is not included amongst the enumerated powers. The same process of reasoning would apply with full force to the complete refutation of the delusive suggestion sometimes made, that the power to protect manufactures is an incident to the power "to regulate commerce." It is denied, that the power to protect manufactures is an incidental power, or partakes any thing of an incidental character. It is asserted, that it is, in itself, an original substantive power; and incomparably more important than the power to regulate commerce itself; to which it is pretended to be an incident. The tariff law is not a regulation of commerce. It is a law for the protection of domestic manufactures; and the means employed for that end, consist in the imposition of duties upon foreign goods; not of any regulation of commerce. The regulation of commerce, therefore, is not the end of the law, nor the means employed by the law to effect the end; which end is the protection of manufactures. The object of this suggestion, therefore, seems to be, disingenuously to arrive at the exercise of a plain, obvious, and palpable power, by indirect, which cannot be approached by direct means. The protection of manufactures involves

the most despotic and dangerous power that can be exercised by Government in any form. It places the occupation and property of every man, under the control of the Government, and thus converts the citizen into the slave, the natural man into a governmental machine. It furnishes the widest scope for the false suggestions and false calculations of human ambition, human avarice, and human cunning, which, in the absence of all moral principle, introduces injustice and inequality between the different sections of the Union, and amongst individuals in all its parts. The present tariff law affords the most conspicuous evidences of these facts and consequences; and, if persevered in, must, in the opinion of the committee, eventuate in the most frightful, consolidated despotism, or in the severance of the Union of these States.

But whether the object of the tariff law be legitimate or not, it is certain, that, under the operation of the very high imposts laid upon foreign goods, a legal capacity is given to the domestic manufacturer of the like goods, to demand a premium in the sale of those goods to his customers; which premium consists of their money, and is over and above the actual worth of the articles sold. Hence, every purchaser pays, first, for the article, its full, actual value, and then pays an additional price as a premium for the protection of the owner of the manufacturing stock, or in other words, for his encouragement to cause the article to be made: and through this process, property is taken from its owner and given to another person, without receiving in exchange, full, and actual value. The committee, therefore report, as their opinion, that the law, generally called the tariff law, does, in its operation, violate the rights of private property, by taking it from its owner and giving it to another person, not rendering public service.

The last object of enquiry is in the following words: "Whether, under the operations of the tariff law, a portion of the proceeds of the labor of the inhabitants of this Commonwealth is not transferred to other parts of the United States, in violation of the two great principles upon which the Constitution of the United States is founded, to wit: generality and equality; and, if so, to report, as far as practicable, the amount of the value of such proceeds, thus transferred." The committee conceive this enquiry to be extremely interesting to the people of this Commonwealth; because it will serve to show, that, whilst they are taxed by imposts on foreign goods to an enormous amount, for the purpose of defraying the prodigal expenditures of the General Government; they are, at the same time, taxed for the purpose of paying an enormous tribute to manufacturers in other parts of the United States. The fact is well known, that a very large amount of domestic goods is brought from other parts of the United States to this Commonwealth, and sold to the inhabitants thereof for consumption. Under the legal capacity given to the venders of these goods, by the enormous duties on imported foreign goods, the venders are enabled to add to the actual value of the article sold, the premium thus granted for its protection; which would not be the case, if the duties on foreign goods were reduced to a principle of revenue, and all the unwarrantable expenditures of the Government were happily to be dispensed with. This premium to the manufacturer consists of the money of the consumer, and is the tribute which the consumer pays the manufacturer, under the ta-

riff law ; a tribute, in the opinion of the committee, as little founded in right as the British Colonial tribute demanded on tea ; and many fold greater in amount : A tribute, which, in the judgment of the committee, ought never to have been imposed by the General Government, nor to have been borne by the people of this Commonwealth, longer than they could call into action constitutional and peaceable means of relieving themselves from so undeserved and odious a burthen. The committee think it extremely desirable to ascertain the probable amount of the tribute annually thus drawn from the inhabitants of this Commonwealth, as a premium to manufacturers in other parts of the United States. But the committee, at this late period of the session, find themselves without the means of ascertaining the probable amount with probable certainty.

In regard to the instruction to the committee, to report such measures for the adoption of the General Assembly, as they shall think will most effectually tend to arrest the usurpations of the General Government, if, upon enquiry, any should be found to exist,—your committee would observe : That, from the advanced period of the present session, they find themselves precluded from all attempts at recommending any system of efficient measures of counteraction ; but, relying upon the justice and intelligence of the people at large, and upon the co-operation, in any measures which may hereafter be recommended for adoption, of such parts of the United States as have a common interest with Virginia upon the subject,—the committee recommend to this General Assembly, to enter its most solemn protest against the foregoing usurpations of the General Government ; and, therefore, propose for its adoption, the following resolutions :

The General Assembly of Virginia, actuated, as it always has been, by the most sincere disposition for the preservation of the Union of these States—believing that the Union can only be preserved, by keeping the General and State Governments within their respective spheres of action, as marked out by the Constitution of the United States—being also sincerely desirous that the General Government should be protected in the full and free exercise of all the specified powers granted to it by the Constitution of the United States—and being, at the same time, deeply impressed with a sense of its own duty, to preserve, unimpaired, all the rights of the People and Government of this State, conferred upon it by the Constitution of the State, and of the United States—finds itself reluctantly constrained to enter its most solemn protest against the usurpations of the General Government, as described in the report of its committee—Therefore,

Resolved, That this General Assembly, in behalf of the People and Government of this State, does, hereby, most solemnly protest against the claim or exercise of any power whatever, on the part of the General Government, to make internal improvements within the limits and jurisdiction of the several States, and particularly within the limits of the State of Virginia ;—and also, against the claim or exercise of any power whatever, asserting or involving a jurisdiction over any part of the territory within the limits of this State, except over the objects and in the mode specified in the Constitution of the United States.

Resolved, In like manner, that this General Assembly does, hereby, most solemnly protest against any claim or exercise of power, whatever, on the part of the General Government, which serves to draw money from the inhabitants of this State, into the Treasury of the United States, and to disburse it for any object, whatever, except for carrying into effect the grants of power to the General Government contained in the Constitution of the United States.

Resolved, In like manner, that this General Assembly does most solemnly protest against the claim or exercise of any power, whatever, on the part of the General Government, to protect domestic manufactures, the protection of manufactures not being amongst the grants of power to that Government, specified in the Constitution of the United States;—and also, against the operations of the act of Congress, passed May 22d, 1824, entitled, “an act, to amend the several acts imposing duties on imports,” generally called the Tariff law, which vary the distributions of the proceeds of the labor of the community, in such a manner, as to transfer property from one portion of the United States to another, and to take private property from the owner for the benefit of another person, not rendering public service,—as unconstitutional, unwise, unjust, unequal and oppressive.

The following resolutions were moved by Mr. Webster, in the year 1820, and adopted, probably unanimously, by a Town Meeting of the merchants of Boston, the head-quarters of good principles.—They correspond so exactly, in tenor and spirit, with the foregoing resolutions, that I should have been guilty of plagiarism, if I had not had express reference to them, provided I had ever seen them, before writing those resolutions. I had, however, never seen them, until within a few months past. They are now published here, not only as precedents to justify the principles of the resolutions, so far as they regard the tariff, but to prove the erroneous statements made by many, and by some who ought to have known better, that the unconstitutionality of protecting manufactures by high tariffs, never was asserted until it appeared in those resolutions;—whereas, I assert; to the best of my recollection, I never heard the right to protect manufactures, in any way whatever, asserted to be amongst the powers granted to the general government, until the years 1823, 1824, except so far as that effect might incidentally be produced in the honest exercise of the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, excises, and “imposts,” for the purposes of revenue. It is extraordinary, whilst the administration partizans give Mr. Clay the exclusive merit of originating the “American system,” falsely so called, in 1823, 1824, they insist, at the same time, that it was the system of Washington, of Adams, of Jefferson, of Madison—and whilst this Anglican American system, introduced in 1824, was then declared, and is still declared to be a new æra in the practical administration of the government, it is declared to be the old system, coeval with the government itself; and is attempted to be supported by precedents, from the first installation of the government. How inconsistent!!! Yet the public are most sorely pressed to swallow both pills.

Resolved, That we have regarded with pleasure, the establishment, and success of manufactures among us, and consider their growth, when natural and spontaneous, and *not the effect of a system of bounties, and protection*, as an evidence of general wealth and prosperity."

Resolved, That, relying on the ingenuity, enterprise and skill of our fellow-citizens, we believe, that all manufactures adapted to our character, and circumstances, will be introduced and extended, as soon, and as far, as will promote the public interests, without any further protection than they now receive."

Resolved, That no objection ought ever to be made to any amount of taxes, *equally apportioned and imposed for the purpose of raising revenue, necessary for the support of government; but that taxes imposed on the people for the sole benefit of any one class of men, are equally inconsistent with the principles of our constitution, and with sound judgment.*"

Resolved, That the supposition, that until the proposed tariff, or some similar measure be adopted, we are, and shall be, dependant on foreigners for the means of subsistence and defence, is, in our opinion, altogether fallacious and fanciful, and derogatory to the character of this nation."

Resolved, That high bounties on such domestic manufactures as are principally benefitted by that tariff, favor great capitalists rather than personal industry, or the owners of small capitals; and, therefore, that we do not perceive its tendency to promote national industry."

Resolved, That we are equally incapable of discovering its beneficial effects on agriculture, since the obvious consequence of its adoption would be, the farmer must give more than he now does for all he buys, and receive less for all he sells."

Resolved, That the imposition of duties which now are enormous, and deemed by a large portion of the people to be unequal and unjust, is dangerous, as it encourages the practice of smuggling."

Resolved, That in our opinion, the proposed tariff, and the principles on which it is avowedly formed, would, if adopted, have a tendency, however different may be the motives of those who recommend them, to diminish the industry, impede the prosperity, and corrupt the morals of the people."

Governor Randolph's public statement was intended to follow Mr. Jefferson's letter. It is introduced, 1st. To show his approbation of the principles upon which I published Mr. Jefferson's letter; and having preceded that publication, I thought, substantially called for it; and it was, partly, in consequence of that opinion, that the publication took place at the time it did.

2d. Governor Randolph having been unwarrantably attacked in the newspapers, I thought it due to him, to publish the letter for his vindication. The opinions of Mr. Jefferson, contained in the letter, being in his own hand writing, could not be denied by any one; and those opinions, more than justified Governor Randolph for his statement of Mr. Jefferson's opinions respecting the present alarming crisis of the

country; whilst they had no other bearing upon the present Presidential election, than from inferences naturally deducible from them.

To the Editors of the (Charlottesville) Advocate.

GENTLEMEN,—In reply to your written application for a statement of certain political sentiments uttered by Mr. Jefferson sometime in the year, 1825, I must first remark, that I do not now consider myself at liberty after your request, to withhold it from your paper. My opinion has ever been this, that in a free and equal society, upon public matters of such importance, the public are entitled to demand, through any of their organs of communication, the sentiments of public characters of long and high standing, from themselves, and most assuredly so, after their decease, from persons to whom they have been unreservedly made known.

I was induced to relate what I had heard, the first time I did relate it, by some illiberal expressions applied to General Jackson, a conduct which would have been perhaps still more revolting to my feelings in regard to Mr. Adams; for both are fully worthy in my estimation of the high honor they receive from their fellow citizens at present; but the former I have never yet seen.

The occasion of which you speak, when we were all present at the reading of General Jackson's reply to Mr. Clay, was, I candidly think, the second time I ever mentioned the fact in question. I am very sure I did hear Mr. Jefferson say, and I think it was about the last of July or the first of August, 1825, but it might have been in December, that it was fortunate for the country that Gen. Jackson was likely to be fit for public life four years after; for it seemed to him to be the only hope left of avoiding the dangers manifestly about to arise out of the broad construction now again given to the Constitution of the United States, which effaced all limitations of powers, and left the General Government, by theory, altogether unrestrained. That its character was plainly enough about to be totally changed, and that a revolution which had been hitherto indistinctly contemplated at a very great distance, was now suddenly, and unexpectedly, brought close to our view. Of General Jackson, Mr. Jefferson often said, that he was an honest, sincere, firm, clear-headed, and strong-minded man; of the soundest political principles; which he knew well, from having observed his conduct while a Senator of the United States, when he was Vice President himself. He had no doubt that if General Jackson should be brought into office to correct the alarming tendency towards formidable, and otherwise irremediable evils, beginning to develop itself in the administration of the general government, he would be entirely faithful to that object. This conversation took place either immediately after the convention in Staunton of 1825, or in December following; and it was the last free expression of his sentiments I ever heard; a calamitous change in the private affairs of both having occurred shortly after, which prevented my being much with him, by placing him through imperious circumstances, in a situation requiring him to be unfriendly to my greatest interests.

Having been an elector myself in 1824, when Mr. Crawford's personal condition was deemed so very doubtful, I know certainly that Mr. Jefferson did then prefer Mr. Adams, after *him*. Indeed I never heard Mr. Jefferson speak of Mr. Adams, from the year 1792, without acknowledging that he was an able, learned and honest man; to which he often added, before the period mentioned, that Mr. Adams would make a safe Chief Magistrate of the Union, and was the most fit of all the New England men. Towards Mr. Clay, as a politician, Mr. Jefferson constantly manifested a very strong repugnance, and often said that he was merely a splendid orator, without any valuable knowledge from experience or study, or any determined public principles founded in sound political science, either practical or theoretical. With this impression on my mind I left Mr. Clay at Monticello, when I went to the Legislature, three days before the meeting of the electoral colleges, in December, 1824. I had heard some little discussion between him and Mr. Jefferson, of those important points of constitutional doctrine, and political economy, upon which they differed so widely. I went determined to vote for Mr. Adams, in case Mr. Crawford should be acknowledged indisputably out of condition to serve. It did not appear to me that Mr. Jefferson even viewed Mr. Clay in the light he is now viewed, by numbers, as a man likely to be dangerous to the Union from his principles; or that he ever contemplated for him any other elevation than what he had already enjoyed in the House of Representatives. Should Mr. Clay demonstrate to the world that Mr. J. underrated him, I shall be among the first to acknowledge a genuine feeling of civic pride at it; for he is a Virginian, and my strongest public attachment of all is to the prosperity and honor of Virginia. If what I have said should excite resentment, I shall hold Mr. Clay, and him only, responsible to me for any improper expression of that feeling.

With great respect,

TH. M. RANDOLPH, Sen.



Extract from a letter addressed "to the Honorable the Speaker and Gentlemen of the House of Delegates of Virginia."—Dated November 26, 1812.

"I wish the General Assembly to be informed, that I have been acting in the representative character for more than twenty years; that during that whole time, I have taken peculiar delight in the character of the representative of the people; that I not only have never made an attempt to change it for an executive one, but have invariably repelled every temptation to such a change: of course, a small portion of the loaves and fishes have fallen to my lot: whilst my individual, pecuniary sacrifices, have not been inconsiderable. During this whole time, equally undeterred by apprehensions of popular resentments, and unseduced by allurements of personal aggrandisement, I have unremittingly devoted the best energies of my mind,

and the honest dictates of my best judgment, to the public service. From this course of conduct, I have derived consolation, support, and happiness; and it is fortunate for man, that whilst he is at all times subject to the assaults of others, he may be sole master of one great good—an approving conscience. Of this one good, I have heretofore taken, and shall hereafter take, the most precious care; and whilst I feel the most unbounded respect for the General Assembly, and shall delight in the possession of its good opinion, and of that of my fellow citizens generally, I am not now prepared, and never can be prepared, to offer up this one good, as a propitiation to any tribunal upon earth."

Richmond, Oct. 2, 1798.

SIR,

The impaired state of my health has induced me to retire from public employment; I therefore do hereby resign my seat in the House of Representatives of the United States.

Be pleased sir, to accept my respectful compliments, &c.

WILLIAM B. GILES.

To THE GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA.

IN COUNCIL, August 11, 1804.

The board took into consideration the appointment of a Senator of the United States, in the room of Abraham B. Venable, Esq., resigned.

Whereupon, William B. Giles, Esq. was unanimously elected.

IN THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES, December 4, 1804.

The House proceeded by joint ballot with the Senate, to the election of a Senator of the United States, to supply the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Wilson C. Nicholas, Esq.

Whereupon, William B. Giles, Esq. was duly elected.

IN THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES, Friday, Dec. 7, 1804.

The House proceeded to the election of a Senator of the United States, to supply the vacancy occasioned by the expiration of the term of service of William B. Giles, Esq.

Whereupon, William B. Giles, was duly elected.

IN THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES, Wednesday, Jan. 2, 1811.

The House proceeded by joint ballot, to the election of a Senator of the United States, to supply the vacancy occasioned by the expiration of the term of service of William B. Giles, Esq.

Whereupon, William B. Giles was duly elected.

Richmond, November 23, 1815.

To His Excellency

WILSON C. NICHOLAS,

GOVERNOR OF VIRGINIA.

SIR,

A period has at length arrived, when our beloved country, after successfully passing through the trials of a just and honorable war, against a powerful nation, is enjoying all the blessings of peace, with the fairest prospects, under the guidance of wise counsels, and the divine protection, of their long continuance.

This fortunate, and happy condition of the country, affords me a favorable opportunity, of indulging myself in a desire, I have long felt, of retiring altogether to scenes of domestic life. This consideration, however, would not, of itself, furnish a sufficient motive to induce me to carry this purpose into effect, during the present senatorial term; but another circumstance has taken place, which I conceive, ought to have its influence upon my determination in this respect. In consequence of an absence from home, for a portion of each year, during a period of nearly five-and-twenty years, in which I have been engaged in serving the people in the representative character, my private concerns have become materially deranged; and, in my judgment, a strong obligation, is therefore, imposed upon me, to give my personal attention to their re-establishment. These considerations united, have determined me, to withdraw from public service at this time. For these reasons, I do hereby resign my office of Senator in the Senate of the United States. I take great pleasure, Sir, in availing myself of this occasion, to renew to your excellency, assurances of my high considerations, and sincere personal regards, &c.

WILLIAM B. GILES.

REVISED CODE, *page 164, vol. 1, chap. 51.*

SECTION 32. Whereas the freedom of speech, and proceedings, appertaineth of right to the General Assembly, and the preservation thereof is necessary to secure the liberty of the people:—

Be it enacted, That if any person shall arrest or prosecute, or be aiding or abetting in arresting and prosecuting a member or members of the Senate or House of Delegates, for, or on account of any words spoken or written; any propositions made, or proceedings had, in the said Senate or House of Delegates; every such person, so offending, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be apprehended, committed, and tried therefor, as in other cases of misdemeanors, before the general court, or a superior court of law of this commonwealth; and being thereof convicted, by the verdict of a jury, shall be adjudged to suffer imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year, and shall pay a fine not exceeding two thousand dollars; which imprisonment and fine shall be assessed by a jury.

SEC. 33. And if any member or members of the said Senate or House of Delegates, shall be arrested or imprisoned, for, or on ac-

count of any words, spoken or written, or for any proposition made, or proceedings had, in said Senate or House of Delegates, such member or members may apply to the general court, or a superior court of law, or any judge thereof in vacation, for a writ of habeas corpus, who are hereby empowered and required to issue the same, returnable before the said court, or said judge, or any other judge, and, upon the return thereof, to liberate and discharge such member or members.

SEC. 34. The provisions of this act shall be extended to the arresting and prosecuting any person or persons, for words spoken or written, or for any propositions made, or proceedings had, in said Senate or House of Delegates, and to the discharging and liberating any person or persons, by habeas corpus, as aforesaid, although such person or persons shall, by disqualification, or from any other causes, have ceased to be a member of the said Senate or House of Delegates, at the time of such arrest or prosecution, or of the trial, judgment, or imprisonment, in consequence thereof: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall, in any respect, extend to the power which either House of the General Assembly now hath, or may exercise over their respective members.



“Having been informed, that much excitement was produced amongst the members of the last General Assembly, from intimations, that I had wantonly introduced the subject of instructions, for the sole purpose of contemptuously attacking the rights of that body, &c. &c. &c.; I have deemed it proper to counteract this gross misrepresentation, by annexing to this explanation an extract from the speech of the honorable Mr. Crawford, to which mine was a reply. The deservedly high standing of this gentleman in the Senate, and throughout the United States, imposed on me an imperious obligation to notice observations of the character of those contained in the annexed extract. The object of my reply was, to demonstrate the truth of the principle asserted in the instructions, to assert the right of the General Assembly to give them; and to vindicate it against the imputation of unworthy motives, inducing the act of instructions on its part. It is believed, that nothing will be necessary to the justification of my motives on that occasion, in the opinion of every gentleman, who feels a just sensibility to the honor of the General Assembly; but, first reading the annexed extract, and then transporting himself, in imagination, from the floor of the General Assembly, to the floor of the Senate, under the peculiar circumstances attending me on that occasion. It is a subject of regret, that the duties thus imposed on me, have been executed so unfortunately, in behalf of the General Assembly, as to have drawn on me its public censure.”

Extract from Mr. Crawford's speech.

“It is said, the states have reserved to themselves the exclusive right of erecting banks. That the states have exercised the right of

establishing banks, is a fact, not to be denied; but that they have the right under the constitution, is extremely questionable. Had these great states, who have undertaken, by their instructions, to influence the decision of this question by Congress, contented themselves with the exercise of this right to establish banks, I should not upon this occasion enter into an investigation of that right. But these great states, not content with the exercise of an usurped authority, are by usurpation attempting to legislate for Congress. And, sir, what is the inducement with these great states to put down the bank of the United States? Their avarice, combined with the love of domination. They have erected banks, in many of which, they hold stock to a considerable amount, and they wish to compel the United States to use their banks, as places of deposit for their public monies; by which they expect to increase their dividends. And in the banks in which they hold no stock, many of the individual members of their legislatures are stockholders, and no doubt were influenced to give instructions by motives of sheer avarice."

"Mr. Crawford's speech continues the subject for nearly a page farther; but this short extract is abundantly sufficient for my purpose. Suppose I had remained silent, under the serious charges thus brought forward against the General Assembly, and the individual members; would not such silence have justly subjected me to the censure of both? Could it then have been expected, when I spoke out in the defence of both, and placed them upon honorable and dignified ground, as I then thought, and still think; that I should have incurred their censure for such defence!!! That it should be said that I wantonly introduced the subject of instructions, unconnected with the debate, from the miraculous motive of manifesting a contemptuous disrespect towards the General Assembly."

Extract from the speech in reply to Mr. Crawford, pages 1, 18—page 19—pages 19 and 20—pages 25, 26.

Page 1st.—"Mr. President—It is with great reluctance that I find myself compelled to enter into the discussion of the subject now under the consideration of the Senate; but the observations which fell from the honorable gentleman from Georgia (Mr. Crawford) were of such a character as to impose on me an irresistible obligation to present that view of the subject which has resulted from the best reflections I have been able to bestow upon it. *This obligation arises from the very high respect I entertain for the Legislature of the State I have the honor to represent*—the great respect I feel for the gentleman, who made the observations, as well as from the respect manifestly due to myself."

Pages 18, 19. "I will now proceed to animadvert upon some important observations made by the gentleman, upon the right of the legislatures of the respective states, to instruct the senators of the United States:

"Acting as I now am, Mr. President, under the influence of instructions from the legislature of the state I have the honor to represent,

I feel myself imperiously called upon, to notice some observations which fell from the honorable gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. Crawford,) and the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Leib,) in relation to that subject.

Pages 19, 20. "The gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. Leib,) after having read his instructions, informed the Senate—"that he represented one of the great states, which had given instructions, and that he felt himself absolutely bound by them in the vote he should give on the present question; that he considered himself *the representative of the legislature of Pennsylvania*; that it was the principal, and he the agent, and bound to carry into effect its will," &c. &c.

"However high may be the respect I generally entertain for the opinion of the honorable gentleman, (Mr. Leib,) I am compelled to dissent from him in these opinions. I feel myself compelled too, to express this dissent, lest it might be supposed, that being similarly circumstanced with that gentleman, on the present question, my conduct might be influenced by similar considerations. I do not consider myself the representative of the legislature of Virginia, although I feel the most unbounded confidence in its wisdom and patriotism, and the highest respect for its proceedings. I consider myself the representative of the people of the United States, delegated to that character by the legislature of Virginia. As an evidence of the correctness of this opinion, I have only to remark, that the laws which I contribute to pass, in the character of senator, are co-extensive with the United States, and operate upon the people thereof in their individual capacities. They do not operate upon the state legislatures in their corporate characters; except in cases where, in that character, they are connected with the federal government, or instrumental in the execution of some of its powers. Still less do they operate upon the legislature of Virginia exclusively; of course, I cannot consider myself as the representative of that legislature exclusively, as its agent, and bound in all cases to execute its will upon this floor. It is not necessary, *nor do I mean to question, the right of the state legislature, so long practised upon, to instruct the senators of the United States, chosen by them respectively*; because that might produce an unmeaning and useless discussion about terms; but I mean to inquire whether the exercise of the right imposes a constitutional obligation on the senator instructed, to obey? In what the real obligation to obedience consists? Whether the instruction is injunctive and compulsory on him; or addressed only to his discretion? Or, in other words, whether the senator instructed has not a right to disobey? And whether such disobedience violates any moral or political obligation?

Pages 25, 26. "The gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. Crawford,) was pleased to say, that in giving instructions to the senators upon this occasion, the great states had been influenced solely by motives of avarice. I regret the remark; and I think, if the gentleman would dispassionately re-consider it, he would also regret it. I think he would admit, that the Legislature of Virginia could not have acted under the influence of such a motive.—And, sir, I feel a pride,

and a pleasure, in standing here to repel the imputation, and to do justice to the real motives of the Legislature. I am at a loss to determine what are the peculiar circumstances which could have induced the gentleman to ascribe the motives of avarice to the Virginia Legislature on this occasion. It is true that a branch of the Bank of the United States, with the trifling capital of 300,000 dollars, is established at Norfolk, and that a branch of the Bank of Virginia is also established there. But these circumstances furnish no possible motive of avarice to the Virginia Legislature. The amount of capital and its effects, are quite unimportant to the State. Norfolk itself, although equally respectable and important with any other portion of the State of the same extent and population, is not sufficient to excite the avarice of the Virginia Legislature.

"The Legislature of Virginia consists principally of agriculturists, residing in the interior of the State, who concern themselves very little with banks and bank operations. They, therefore, have made no calculation of pecuniary interests upon this occasion. They have acted, in giving instructions, from the purest and most honorable motives, from a conviction that the power of granting charters of incorporation was not conferred on Congress by the Constitution, but reserved to the States respectively. That this conviction alone, was the inducement to their instructions, will appear obvious from the instructions themselves, which I beg leave to read :

"The General Assembly view with the most serious concern, the late attempt which has been made to obtain from Congress a renewal of the charter incorporating the Bank of the United States. This Assembly are deeply impressed with the conviction that the original grant of that charter was unconstitutional; that Congress has no power whatever to renew it; and that the exercise of such a power would be not only unconstitutional, but a dangerous encroachment on the sovereignty of the States :—Therefore,

"Resolved, That the Senators of this State, in the Congress of the United States, be instructed, and our Representatives most earnestly requested, in the execution of their duties as faithful Representatives of their country, to use their best efforts, in opposing, by every means within their power, the renewal of the charter of the Bank of the United States.

January 22d, 1811.

Agreed to.

ROBT. TAYLOR, S. S.
JAS. BARBOUR, S. H. D.

A copy from the original,

Test, JAMES PLEASANTS, C. H. D."

"It manifestly appears from these instructions, that a conviction of the unconstitutionality of the original bank law, was the sole inducement with the Legislature for giving them: and here, sir, permit me to express a hope, that the arguments I have urged in favor of this opinion, will amply justify the Legislature in the honest conviction under which it acted. Permit me also to remark, sir, that whilst I

cannot admit that instruction in any case, possesses a mandatory influence over the Senator, and whilst I think the practice of giving instructions in general, and upon general points of policy, is attended with injurious effects upon the proceedings of this government, &c. — yet in a case of rights reserved to the States, the Legislature not only have the right, but it is their duty to express their opinion to, or instruct their Senators (for I will not cavil about terms) to resist the usurpation of the general government. It is the mildest way in which their agency can be brought to bear upon all such cases; and this being a case in point, the instructing Legislatures stand perfectly justified in the conduct they have adopted in that respect. I hope, sir, I have rescued the Legislature of Virginia from the unmerited imputation thrown against it, inadvertently I am sure, by the gentleman from Georgia, (Mr. Crawford,) and have shewn that it has been influenced by the purest, the most laudable, and the most honorable motives."

It would seem, from a very able report of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, adopted in March 1815, immediately after the termination of the last war; that, the embargo, and non-intercourse laws, grew out of the war power; as indeed, was the universal understanding at that time. The report was made in reply to a proposition, to amend the constitution, limiting the power of the General Government over embargoes, and non-intercourse laws, made by the Legislatures of Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey; and is in the following words:

"By the next amendment it is proposed, that "Congress shall not have power to lay any embargo on the ships or vessels of the citizens of the United States, in the ports or harbors thereof, for more than sixty days."

"The Committee can see little in the principle of this proposal, to recommend it, and they foresee in practice very serious inconveniences from it. In most other nations, an embargo is principally used as a temporary detention, to conceal or to facilitate, the departure of some expedition; but in addition to these causes, our peculiar situation gives to such a measure, a character of defensive war, as well as of offensive hostility. An embargo may here be imposed as a preliminary to war, for the purpose of retaining at home, resources, which might fall into the hands of adversaries, and of warning our citizens to seek shelter from impending hostilities. This country too, stands in a relation to the world, which no other nation occupies. The United States is a great granary, from which many other countries are supplied, and some have been occasionally fed. To withhold for a time those necessary supplies from a nation committing aggressions against us, is a measure of fair, obvious, and effectual hostility, by which the offending nation may be reclaimed to a just course of conduct. Such a measure should therefore be left with other incidents of war, to the discretion of Congress. But it is obvious, that the efficacy of an embargo may depend on its duration. Approaching hostilities may not be averted or determined in sixty days. Within sixty days, a refusal to furnish sup-

plies may be productive of no inconvenience to an enemy. If it be said the embargo may be renewed, why the necessity of any limitation of time, since the same power which can renew a limited, may repeal an unqualified embargo, when circumstances require it. But during the long recess of Congress, it would be impracticable to renew an embargo every sixty days. The more judicious plan seems to be, to trust the power where it now is; and this, the more willingly, as our recent experience will have furnished the means of ascertaining the nature and value of that species of restriction."

What strange thoughtlessness, and forgetfulness, mark the politicians of the day !!!

The following is the section of appropriation for carrying into effect the Cumberland Road law.—General Taylor read this section, except that part of it which appears now in italics; so much was omitted.—This part contains a provision for reimbursing any money which may be paid at the Treasury, for making that road, out of the fund to accrue from the sales of the public lands within Ohio.—This provision, I believe, is dispensed with, since the claim of the general power to make internal improvements has been asserted. In this provision, will be seen, the distinction between the principle upon which the Cumberland Road was established, and the principle upon which the general power to make internal improvements is now set up by the general government. I intended to have made some observations upon this subject, but inadvertently omitted to do so.

The section is here introduced, as forming a material part of the true history of the Cumberland Road law.

"Sect. 6. And be it further enacted, That the sum of \$ 30,000 be, and the same is hereby appropriated, to defray the expense of laying out and making said road. And the President is hereby authorised to draw from time to time on the Treasury for such parts, or at any one time for the whole of said sum, as he shall judge the service requires. Which sum of \$ 30,000, shall be paid, first out of the fund of two per cent. reserved for laying out and making roads to the state of Ohio, by virtue of the seventh section of an act passed on the 30th day of April, 1802, entitled, "An act to enable the people of the eastern division of the territory north west of the Ohio river, to form a Constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, and for other purposes." Three per cent. of the appropriation contained in said seventh section being directed by a subsequent law, to the laying out, opening and making roads within the State of Ohio. And, secondly, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, chargeable upon, and reimbursable at the Treasury, by said fund of two per cent., as the same shall accrue."

The following letters are published here to show—1st, That the office of Governor was freely conferred, without solicitation.

2d, That notwithstanding all the popular clamor, raised about the

question of instructions, "I never could, under any circumstances, permit myself to doubt of the ultimate justice of my country:" of course, could not have been influenced by popular clamor in retiring from the Senate in 1815.

February 14th, 1827.

SIR,—On behalf of the joint committee of the Senate and House of Delegates, appointed for that purpose, we beg leave to communicate to you your election to the office of Governor, or Chief Magistrate of this Commonwealth, from the 4th day of March next, in the place of John Tyler, Esq. elected to the Senate of the United States.

In performing this duty, sir, we cannot withhold the expression of our own gratification, at this distinguished proof, not only of the steady adherence, on the part of the Legislature, to those great principles which Virginia has so long cherished, and of which you have been a distinguished advocate; but because in it, we also perceive the just reward of a long course of valuable public services, both in the councils of the Union and of your own native State. With sentiments of the highest consideration and respect, we have the honor to be, &c.

SAMUEL TAYLOR, *C. C. S.*
JOHN W. NASH, *C. C. H. D.*

Wm. B. GILES, Esq.

RICHMOND, Feb. 14th, 1827.

Samuel Taylor, Esq.

Chairman of a Committee of the Senate, &c.

John W. Nash, Esq.

Chairman of a Committee of the House of Delegates, &c.

GENTLEMEN,—Your communication, on behalf of the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Delegates, of my election to the office of Governor, or Chief Magistrate of this Commonwealth, by the General Assembly, has called into action the liveliest sensibilities of my heart; and the peculiar circumstances attending the election have served to enhance its honors, and to increase both my obligations and my gratification upon the occasion.

If it should have been my good fortune, heretofore, to have rendered valuable services both in the councils of the Union, and my own native State, I can now only observe; that I have already derived abundant consolation and happiness, from a consciousness of having at all times, faithfully discharged all my public duties; and I never could permit myself for one moment, under any circumstances, to doubt the ultimate justice of my country, in putting a proper estimate upon those services. Be pleased, gentlemen, to inform the General Assembly, that I accept, with a grateful heart, the high office it has been pleased to confer on me; and all I have to offer in return is: a solemn pledge; that whatever of mental and physical capacities, I have remaining, shall be sedulously employed in promoting the welfare of our beloved Virginia, particularly, and of our

common country, generally; should any of its concerns fall within my official sphere of action.

Permit me, gentlemen, to tender you and the committee, my sincere thanks for the very polite and flattering manner, in which you have made the communication and my fervent prayers for your individual health, prosperity and happiness.

WM. B. GILES.

APPENDIX.



Upon reviewing the proof-sheets of the foregoing pamphlet, it occurred to me, that I had omitted my remarks in reply to Mr. Clay's notions of the positive independence of foreign nations on the part of the United States, after it was too late to introduce them in their proper place; and having written two numbers upon that subject in 1824, I determined to introduce them at the close of the pamphlet, as substitutes for the omitted remarks. The opinions therein expressed have not become impaired; but are enforced and confirmed, by experience, and farther reflection.

Tariff Bill—Independence of Foreign Nations.

I have heretofore taken the liberty of saying, that the pretexts for the tariff bill appear to me to be flimsy, visionary, unsounded, and many of them ridiculous. I will now briefly examine one of these pretexts, which seems to me to be the basis of all the rest—indeed, all those which have branched forth from the parent stock, I think, *scel de se*: I shall therefore leave them, at this time, to their own self destruction, or to the destruction of the antagonist arguments of others.—The ultimate object of the tariff bill is avowed to be, to render the United States independent of foreign nations. It would be impossible to tell, how often this phrase has been ushered forth in the newspapers, within the last three or four years; and at this moment, I am as much at a loss to comprehend the precise meaning, intended to be conveyed by it, or the precise object intended to be described by it, as if I had never seen it at all. According to my understanding, there is as little definite meaning or object attached to this phrase, as to any other, of the same number of words, in the English language. I must presume that the phraseologists know themselves what they mean by it; but as I do not, I beg leave to state my own difficulties in that respect; the more especially, as most polemic discussions are found to depend rather upon the want of affixing some precise, definite meaning to the terms used in such discussions, than upon the results from the premises after their precise meaning shall be ascertained and agreed upon. The phrase “independent of foreign nations,” I presume, is intended to describe some state of relation between the United States and foreign nations; but what that precise definite state of relation is, I cannot comprehend from the term itself. The word “independence” is a word of relation. Do the tariff schemers mean by the phrase, “independence of foreign nations,” a positive or relative independence of foreign nations? If they mean a relative independence, how near do they mean to approach to a positive independence? If they mean a positive independence, I then pronounce, that it is neither attainable nor desirable. If they mean a relative independence, then I assert, that the United States do at this time possess all salutary relative independence of foreign nations. If

they did not, the tariff bill would not have the least tendency to produce it; but might, and probably would, tend to lessen the existing independence.

In this world, there is scarcely any thing positive. It is a world of relations and dependencies. This system of relation and dependence is seen throughout all nature. It is seen, as well in regard to national as individual relations and dependences. The great principle of creation is founded in the sexual system. In the relations of individual life, the sexes are made dependant on each other for mutual happiness. In infancy, the child is made dependant upon the parent; and in old age, the parent upon the child. There are also relative degrees of dependance throughout all social and domestic life. The same principle of relation and dependance will be found throughout all scenes of business. The consumer depends upon the merchant to supply his wants of foreign goods; the merchant depends upon the consumer, either for money or other goods in exchange. This system will be found to pervade all callings, and conditions in individual life. To be positively independent in private life, what would it be necessary for an individual to do? He must be his own farmer to raise his own grain, his own miller to grind it; his own cook to bake it, before he could get a piece of bread in his mouth: he must be his own grazier, his own butcher, and his own cook, before he could get a piece of meat in his mouth: and before he could get a pair of shoes on his feet, he must add the occupations of tanner and shoemaker. Besides, he must make all the tools and implements of all his variegated occupations.—Throughout his whole long catalogue of wants, he must observe the same process, to supply each particular want. Upon supplying himself, with his own hands, with the whole of his wants, he would then, and not till then, be a positively independent gentleman. But while this process, if practicable, would render him positively independent of all other creatures, it would render him the most positively dependant slave upon himself. According to this doctrine of positive independence in private life, a gentleman with his pockets astrut with cash, would be dependant upon his tailor, his shoemaker, and upon every body else who contributes to his enjoyments—and the old notion of a gentleman of independent fortune must be abandoned altogether. Heretofore it has been understood, that, when a gentleman has money enough to pay for all his wants, he is independent: not that he is positively so, but relatively so. However wealthy a man may be, he is dependant upon the tailor for his coat, upon the shoemaker for his shoes, and so on to the extent of all his wants: but the furnishers of these wants are dependant upon him for his money. This mutuality of dependance neutralizes its effects, and produces a relative independence, which is all the independence that is practicable, or desirable, amongst mankind in private life. The same principles will be found to extend, and apply in full force to the family of nations. It has pleased the omnipotent Author of creation to form this world with different climates, different soils, different productions, and a vast variety of other differences. One nation produces more of a particular article, suited to the use and enjoyment of man, than it wants for its own use; another nation produces more of another article of a different kind, than it wants for its own use: an exchange of

each surplus production, therefore, becomes necessary for mutual accommodation. Hence the foundation of foreign commerce. For this purpose, God has separated continents and islands, by elements of fluids, and endowed man with skill for navigating them; but he has not seen fit to bestow on any one nation every thing which was necessary or convenient for all its wants: and thus most forcibly demonstrates his design, that a mutual intercourse amongst nations should take place;—or in other words, that commerce should exist amongst mankind. In no one instance has God's infinite goodness and wisdom been more manifest, than in imposing these mutual obligations and dependencies upon mankind, for their own enjoyments, happiness, and the improvement of the human intellect. Through commerce the greatest blessings have been transferred from one nation to another. Letters from Phenicia; the mariner's compass from Genoa; printing from Germany; seeds of various kinds from one country to another; improvements in the fine, agricultural and mechanic arts; and in all the intellectual endowments of the human mind. In all these respects the United States have derived more benefit from commerce, than has fallen to the lot of any other modern nation. They have been greatly blessed too in their own indigenous productions; but it has not pleased God to bless them with every thing useful and necessary to the enjoyment of man: they have not been rendered positively independent of all other nations. There are two articles, amongst others, which are deemed highly desirable amongst all mankind, with which they have been but sparingly supplied—gold and silver. Perhaps, however, the tariff schemers might rely upon the omnipotence of their schemes for diverting labor from its natural into artificial channels, to force a sufficient supply of gold at least from the gold mines of North Carolina; or they might conclude, that gold and silver were not wanted for animal gratifications, and might be dispensed with altogether.

If gold and silver are not to be expunged from our catalogue of wants, then positive independence is not attainable to the United States.—Until the tariff schemers turn alchymists, and shall make gold and silver out of any thing, or nothing, they cannot render the United States positively independent of foreign nations. In regard to relative independence, the United States stand upon high ground in their intercourse with foreign nations; and will continue to do so, until they throw away the abundance of good things which their God has most bountifully bestowed upon them.—He has given them climates, and soils, suited to the production of wheat, cotton, and tobacco, amongst many other good things. These articles are wanted in other countries, and if the United States will not refuse a fair interchange of the surplus of these good things, for the surplus of the good things produced in other countries, which are wanted here, it will always insure to the United States a salutary relative independence of foreign nations. I should not feel at all dependant upon foreign nations for our gold and silver, so long as the nations, which have them, shall indulge the appetite for our flour and tobacco, and a taste for the articles produced by our cotton; and so long as the political schemers of the United States should leave them to their natural effects; and should not drive back the gold and silver by their banking institutions or by other ruinous

schemes. The United States have heretofore claimed pre-eminent ground in their relative intercourse with foreign nations. They possess a thin, active population—a fertile and unoccupied soil—subsistence in abundance. Their surplus productions consist mostly of raw materials, in great demand in foreign nations—whilst in most other countries, the population is crowded—there are more hands than employment—the subsistence scanty, and our raw materials wanted to aid in giving employment to the surplus hands. These circumstances, if not impeded in their natural operations, could not fail to place the United States on 'vantage ground in their relations with foreign nations. A few months ago, I could not help concluding, that the pretension to a relative, salutary independence on the part of the United States, would unquestionably have found an authority in Mr. Speaker of the House of Representatives, which would have been irresistible in its influence with a majority of that House. When I contemplated Mr. Speaker, with his Briarian hands, and fancied him engaged in delivering his infuriated Greek speech; with one hand battering down the constitution of the United States—another battering down state rights, save only the Kentucky non-resident and relief laws,—a third beautifying the United States with internal improvements—a fourth spread over Mexico, and all South America—a fifth stretched forth to European Greece—a sixth with one little finger pointing to Africa, Messurado—a seventh with the fore-finger pointing to the Pacific—mouth of Columbia—and with all the rest busily engaged in unsheathing to the view of trembling, astonished Europe, one million of glittering American bayonets; I thought, that Mr. Speaker must be buoyed up with the hope, and even deluded with the belief, that the United States were positively independent of the whole world—indeed more, that the destinies of the whole world were at their command. Could it have been expected! can it be credited! that within one month after Mr. Speaker, in this gigantic, appalling attitude, had set at defiance one hundred and fifty millions of the most potent people upon earth, that he would advocate the most despotic scheme, upon the ground that the United States were not blessed with even a common salutary independence of foreign nations!! That they were in such a state of dependance, as to call forth all the energies of his mind, to legislate them into a state of relative independence!!! Dependant too, upon whom, or upon what!!! Upon this very Europe, he had just frightened out of its wits! with one million of unsheathed, glittering American bayonets!!! Yet are these strange things now before us!! A great man—a statesman—above all, a President, should be endowed with faculties of forethought and consistency. Not only an union of thought and of action in each particular measure, but a consistency and continuity of thought, and of object in all his measures. Do we find them here? Are not these two schemes grounded upon directly contradictory principles? The one grounded upon a positive independence, which alone could justify setting all Europe at defiance—the other on a dangerous dependance upon this same Europe. But to settle this point, let a resort be had to matter of fact. The United States have not long since been engaged in actual war with Great Britain—the nation upon which the United States are said to be more dependant, than upon any other.

Was this affected dependance materially felt during that war? It certainly was not felt in any material degree, and even so far as it was felt, it arose more from our own folly, than from any control of Great Britain over us. All the articles we wanted, would have been readily furnished upon good terms by Great Britain—not to have been obtained elsewhere; but the United States refused the interchange. Instead of letting Great Britain have our flour cotton, and tobacco, we threw them away as far as they were perishable, laid embargoes, interdicted commercial intercourse, and thus threw every obstruction in the way of our necessary supplies. Even notwithstanding all these unwise obstructions, very little inconvenience was experienced; and in any future case, by a wise policy, all necessary supplies might be anticipated. But admit some temporary inconvenience during a state of war; would that little, adventitious, temporary inconvenience, justify a permanent, unjust, monopolising despotism, during a state of peace, and war? Yet such is the evil, if evil at all, and such the remedy offered by the tariff schemers. The tariff bill, Mr. Speaker supposes, will produce this undefined independence, I presume, within a century, if ever; provided Mr. Speaker should not be mistaken in his political calculations, and speculations; but who in all the world is more likely to be mistaken than Mr. Speaker? for it would seem from Mr. Speaker's whole course of conduct, during the present session of Congress, that he is acting under the influence of some excitable, eccentric, inflammable gas, which has electrified him into a very Hotspur; striking blindsfold at every rustling sound that he hears. If, then, the United States do now enjoy a salutary relative independence of foreign nations: and if a positive independence is neither attainable, nor desirable; upon what ground is it that the whole order of labor now established in the country should be subverted, and a new order of labor introduced, and that too by arbitrary, unequal and unjust artificial regulations? But if more relative independence were desirable, the tariff bill could have no tendency whatever to produce it, and would, in its consequences, produce the opposite effects,

WM. B. GILES,

March 22, 1824.

Wigwam, Amelia County, Va.

Political Schemers—Hard Times.—The Tariff Bill—Independence of Foreign Nations.

In my last No. I expressed the opinion, that the tariff bill, so far from tending to produce a positive independence of foreign nations, would materially tend to lessen our relative independence of them.

I will now give the reasons inducing this opinion. I think it has heretofore been proved, that positive independence is neither attainable nor desirable. That in the ordinations of Providence, in the essential nature of things, there must exist a mutual relative dependence amongst nations, as well as amongst individuals. That this mutual dependance is the true source of a great portion of the improvements, which exalt the human character, and contribute to human refinements, and enjoyments. In corroboration of this doctrine, it will be recollected, that almost every nation upon earth, which has been excluded from the great family of nations, is now seen in the say-

age state. I presume, the Tariff schemers do not mean to drive the United States back to this condition, in quest of positive independence of foreign nations. According to the doctrine of the relative dependance of nations on each other, I lay down this proposition. That in proportion to the increase of the relative dependance of foreign nations upon us, will be the increase of our relative independence of them. Let the effects of the Tariff bill, be tested by this plain principle; and let this test be applied to our commercial relations with Great Britain; with which nation, those relations are the most intimate, and extensive.

The object of the Tariff bill is to coerce the manufactory, by ourselves, of all articles wanted for our consumption; and to exclude Great Britain from the manufactory of any of them. Will not G. Britain by this operation, become less dependent upon us, than she now is, in exact proportion to the extent of this exclusion? Take the articles of boots and shoes, for example. Great Britain is already nearly excluded from all participation in the market of these articles; as I conceive, to the great loss and injury of the United States; and to greater injustice amongst individuals. It is now proposed to make the exclusion absolute. So far then as our intercourse relates to these two articles, Great Britain will be rendered positively independent of the United States by such absolute exclusion.—But suppose, instead of this exclusion, there were ten, twenty, thirty or more thousands of hands employed in Great Britain in preparing boots and shoes for the market of the United States, would not Great Britain feel a material dependance upon the United States, for a market for the articles prepared by these hands? It is presumed the affirmation would be admitted by all. This dependence would be greatly increased by the following considerations: That the population of Great Britain is already overflowing—that there are more British hands than British employment—that, consequently, it is extremely difficult to change hands from one employment to another.—Instead of such change, the unemployed hands necessarily become paupers. That the laboring part of the community is already so oppressed, and plundered by the few, that the great majority of them is left with a bare subsistence. That it would be particularly distressing to the British government to see the pauper list increasing by extrinsic, artificial causes, already increased by intrinsic ones to an amount, which calls for the most anxious and profound consideration of every British political economist. The United States do not furnish the raw materials for the manufacture of these articles; the argument will be doubly enforced in all cases, in which the United States do furnish the raw materials for the manufactured articles.

Take the case of cotton, which is an article of the first consideration. This article is becoming subservient to a vast portion of human wants, and indulgencies; and there is accordingly seen in the wise and benevolent dispensations of Providence, a correspondent extent of climate and soil fitted for its production. The United States have heretofore enjoyed, in some degree, a monopoly of the British market for this article, and by the wise policy of leaving it

to its natural effects, might still further have engrossed the British markets ; but by the unwise policy of laying *exorbitant* duties upon British manufactured cottons, Great Britain has been induced to look out for other sources of supply, and she has not been unsuccessful in her search. If by a liberal intercourse with Great Britain heretofore, in furnishing the cotton, and taking it, in its manufactured state from Great Britain in return, the whole of the raw material had been supplied by the United States, and Great Britain had been thus left without any other adequate source of supply, would not her dependence upon the United States for this important article, have been greater than it now is ? and would not the relative dependence of the United States upon Great Britain for taking the surplus of their raw material have been less than it now is ? If so, the necessary result is, that the relative dependence of the two countries in their commercial intercourse with each other, is injuriously affected by the existing tariff ; and will be much more injuriously affected by the one proposed. It is deemed unnecessary to extend this illustration further. The same reasoning will apply to the whole commercial intercourse between the two countries under similar circumstances. It may be observed, however, that Great Britain has not been inattentive to the effects of the unwise policy of the United States, and ever on the alert, has taken measures to guard herself against it ; whilst these very precautions prove the truth of the reasoning here advanced. Great Britain has looked out for every climate and soil suited to the production of cotton, and she has found them in Egypt, South America and elsewhere. Whilst we hear of 150,000 additional spindles lately erected in Great Britain for twisting cotton, we hear of no apprehensions of the want of a supply of the raw material.

But what will be the effects of the Tariff bill upon the physical strength of the United States ? particularly the Navy ; destined, if not crippled, nor destroyed, at some future time, to become the bulwark and defence of the United States against foreign nations ? — What are to be its effects on commerce and seamen ? will it not ruin the one, and diminish the other ? Suppose it were to convert every American seaman into a shoemaker, would not the physical strength of the country be impaired by the operation ? Suppose it were to drive a portion of your seamen into foreign employment, would not this operation tend still more to impair the physical strength of the nation ? What is to become of the ships, ship builders, and commercial capital ? all to be driven into new occupations, or rendered useless ? All these operations must necessarily tend to diminish the physical strength of the country ; and of course, to render it less independent of foreign nations.

This reasoning is founded, in part, upon the counteraction of the Tariff by G. Britain, and all other foreign nations, which is deemed one inevitable result of the scheme ; and in that event, what will be the effect of such counteractions upon the prices of the great staple articles of cotton, tobacco, flour, rice, &c. ? The prices of these articles must be reduced below their present low prices ; and certain ruin must be the consequences to the growers of them. The grow-

ers of these articles are now suffering, and most justly complaining of "hard times;" produced amongst other causes, by the present exorbitant Tariff. A great number of worthy, wealthy and middling farmers and planters, have already been stripped of a great portion of their property, in a great degree by various governmental schemes. Many have been reduced to poverty; and many driven, most reluctantly, from their native states, and beloved friends, and firesides, to take their chances in the wilderness for better times. Many, however, by great exertions and sacrifices, are now likely to recover from their losses and sufferings; provided they can be permitted to sell the proceeds of their labor for fair natural prices; or even for the present artificial ones; but, if through the baneful influence of the Tariff bill, these prices should artificially be still further reduced, it would not be possible to anticipate the extent of the sufferings of the immediate growers of the articles described; nor of the feelings of the sufferers, when they cannot avoid seeing the true causes of such unjust and undeserved sufferings. This is, at this moment, the case with the surrounding scene of country here. After their past sufferings, from visionary schemers, the people in this part of the country, had just begun to indulge the hope, that if the natural order of things could be permitted in any degree to be restored; or even the present order of things to be continued, they might be enabled so far to reinstate their affairs, as to save their families from utter ruin and despair; but upon the first blush of this hope, this destructive Tariff bill is presented to their view; and in an instant, it has blasted all their fond anticipations. Apprehension and despondency, are again visible upon the countenances of almost all intelligent reflecting men. These are some of the inevitable sectional effects of this most wanton and unwarrantable bill. What will be its effects upon the United States, as an integral nation? It would not be possible for the whole force of human intellect, to anticipate *all* its injurious consequences; but enough may be clearly seen, as I conceive, by the most common impartial capacity, to deter from the adoption of the project, all but its enamoured, fanatical projectors. Only consider its immediate effects upon the exports of the United States.—Deduct the proceeds of cotton, tobacco, flour and rice, from the proceeds of the whole exported productions of the U. States; and what would remain? Comparatively nothing—certainly nothing worth the attention of any commercial nation in Europe. Is there not great danger, then, in tampering with this extremely delicate and important subject? What renders the danger greater at this moment, than any other that could have been chosen, is, that Great Britain and France, are at the same moment, engaged in reviewing their respective Tariffs; and will most undoubtedly retaliate upon the United States, the evils of their own cupidity, vanity and injustice. An European war, even a successful one, would be a great calamity to the United States; but it would be temporary. A commercial war, would be a far greater calamity; and when once commenced, it might be perpetual. The United States are not without experience upon this subject. They have frequently tampered with it before; and never

have they done so, without the severest sacrifices. To the fashionable political schemers, who, I am told, are now panting after a *splendid government* for the United States; who are buoyed up with the enchanted anticipations of squandering millions in ornamenting the United States with internal improvements, I would address myself; and ask, if cut off from the supply of gold and silver from Europe in some way or other, from whence they would get their supplies for the execution of all these splendid phantoms? To the friends of domestic manufactures, I would address myself, and ask, from whence would come the means of paying the manufacturer for his goods, if the growers of the exports of the country are to be stripped of fair prices for their productions? To South America they would look in vain. The condition—the policy of that country is yet contingent, and uncertain. But the great difficulty with that country would be—that upon the return of peace, in a settled state of things, South America would not want any of the exports of the United States, whilst Europe would want them all. When the Bank of the United States wanted specie capital, where did the Bank send for it? Not to South America; but to London. These, and many other destructive effects of the Tariff bill, must be obvious, it appears to me, to the most common observer; but the best faculties of the human mind would only feel their own impotency in the attempt to anticipate *all* its destructive effects. In no one instance in human affairs, is the folly of human wisdom rendered more conspicuous, than in the attempt to foresee *all* the consequences of great political schemes and changes.

When Constantine, at the Council of Nice, seated himself at the feet of the Clergy, little did he think, by that act of *affected* condescension, for he was not then baptized, that he should brutalize a great portion of mankind for above ten centuries.

When the Popes were preaching up the bloody crusades to meek and lowly Christians, little did they think, they were raising up a chivalrous, gallant military spirit, which was destined to shake the adamantine Papal throne itself to its foundation.

When the Virgin Queen was indulging one momentary feeling of humanity, little did she think, that she was preparing the means for cooping up one-eighth* of the whole English population into poor houses in the year 1824; and which might, at some future day, shake the whole fabric of the British constitution to its centre.

When William the 3d established a bank, and funded only £500,000 of public debt, little did he think, that he was laying the foundation of a debt of above £900,000,000; and thereby crushing posterity with its ponderous weight; and little did he think, that he was affording the means for raising a standing army of 150,000 men; and a navy still more colossal.†

When the framers of our constitution, with the most patriotic holy zeal, were carefully looking out for definite, technical terms, to be used in its formation, as bulwarks against the encroachments of power, little did they think, that all their thrice hallowed cares and labors would so soon be set at naught, by a new congressional lexicography.‡

When Mr. Hamilton was projecting the Bank of the United States,

little did he think, that he was creating the prolific mother of four hundred children ; many of them both deformed and decrepid. And little did he think ; that he was throwing back upon Europe, and driving to India, the golden showers, which the desolating European wars were pouring down upon the United States.

When Napoleon, in splendid triumph, with embattled Europe at his heels, was marching upon Moscow, little did he think, he was preparing the means for reseating the Bourbons upon the throne of France ; and for digging his own grave in St. Helena ; there to be buried, with all the vile contumelious insults of the savage Sir Hudson Lowe, heaped upon his own head.

When the Kentucky relief schemers, were authorising about forty banks, to issue bank bills, as a currency for the state, and for the relief of the Kentucky people, little did they think, of how much more value, were the morals of the Kentucky people to themselves, than the exemption from the whole amount of their debts. Little did they think, that the exemption of the debtor from any part of his just obligation to his creditor, would demoralize society, and strip it of all commercial credit abroad. Little, very little did they think, that in less than three years from the period of the adoption of the relief schemes, a mental jubilee would be felt throughout Kentucky, upon every newspaper annunciation of an " AUTO DE FE"—of the very bank bills, which, so shortly before were hailed with delirious joy, by a great portion of the Kentucky people, as the beloved, and promised instruments of relief from all their cares and troubles.

Little, very little do the Tariff schemers think or know—Little, very little can they think, or know of all the consequences of the destructive " Tariff Bill."

WM. B. GILES.

April 15, 1824.

Wigwam, Amelia County, Va.

NOTES.

* " One-eighth of the whole English population is in poor houses." In a former number I had stated the proportion of the paupers to the whole English population at " above one tenth." A more recent estimate has since been made, from which it must be concluded that at this day the proportion is actually above one-eighth ; and must continue to increase under the present governmental oppression. The report under an act passed in 1803, gives the following results : The number of persons relieved in, and out of poor houses, was 1,061,716. In the year 1801, the resident population of England and Wales was 8,872,980 ; the number of parishioners relieved from the poor's rates appears to be twelve in the hundred of the resident population.

† " And a navy still more colossal."—Many other notable examples of the incompetency of the human intellect to foresee all the consequences of great political schemes, might be adduced ; but I will here refer to only three more : and I do it the rather, because they are copied from a speech, delivered by Mr. Speaker in 1816, and ought not to have been forgotten :

"The power to charter companies, is not specified in the grant, and I contend is of a nature not transferable by implication. It is one of the most exalted attributes of sovereignty. In the exercise of this power, we have seen an East India Company created, which has carried dismay, desolation, and death, throughout one of the largest portions of the world. Under the influence of this power, we have seen arise a South Sea Company and a Mississippi Company, that distracted and convulsed all Europe, and menaced a total overthrow of all credit and confidence, and universal bankruptcy."

Could all these consequences have been foreseen by the schemers? Is it possible for any reflecting man not to see that the Tariff bill contains the seeds of more mischiefs than all these schemes put together?

‡ "New Congressional Lexicography."—Examples. Mr. Speaker: To "establish" an incident to a principle, means to "create" or "build" the principle itself. If the framers of the constitution had used Mr. Speaker's substitute, or amendment, instead of their own original term, I think Mr. Speaker would himself have laughed at them, to wit: to "create" or "build" post offices and post roads, the roads having been before "created" or built. This is an example of an affirmative congressional definition—now for a negative one in Mr. Speaker's own words. Extract from Mr. Speaker's celebrated Greek Speech :

"Gentlemen may call it enthusiastic declamation if they please; would to God we could hear such declamation, and the utterance of such feeling from them—in the year of our Lord and Saviour, that Saviour alike of Christian Greece and of us—a proposition was offered, in the American Congress, to send a Messenger to Greece, to inquire into her state and condition, with an expression of our good wishes and our sympathies—and it was rejected. Go home, if you dare; go home, if you can, to your constituents, and tell them that you voted it down—meet, if you *dare*, the appalling countenances of those who sent you here, (he meant no defiance,) and tell them that you shrank from the declaration of your own sentiments—that you cannot tell how, but that some unknown dread, some indescribable apprehension, some indefinable danger, affrighted you—that the spectres of cimetars, and crowns, and crescents, gleamed before you, and alarmed you; and that you suppressed all the noble feelings prompted by religion, by liberty, by national independence, and by humanity." Bah!!! What fustian!!! No real orator would ever solemnly invoke religion; No—never—unless his own heart be enraptured with her charms—Then indeed, *in the sincerity of his own heart*, may he speak, "from the heart, to the heart."

Mr. Speaker meant "no defiance." What did he mean? Were all these fine words and splendid figures uttered without any meaning? If they meant any thing, they meant defiance, according to the old dictionaries. In them, the words "dare" and "defiance" are strict synonyms. Surely two "dares" and one "if you can," would amount to one defiance. The last "dare" is *italicized in the writing*; from which particular mark of attention, readers at a distance are apt to conclude, that, *in the speaking*, the last "dare" must have been emphasized with sonorous and terrific audibility. In point of propriety and decorum, who is the last man in the United States that ought to

have "*dared*" the House of Representatives twice, and to have pointed out the penalties of accepting the challenge to all refractory members?

Example—from the amiable, accomplished and intelligent Mr. M'Lane: To "regulate" commerce, means to "facilitate" commerce. "Regulate," according to the old dictionaries, means to make rules. "Facilitate" to make easy. Apply these definitions to commerce—to make rules for conducting commerce—to make commerce easy. "Facilitate" is one of the most indefinite words in the English language, and therefore the least technical; and of course the least proper to be used in prescribing definite rules of conduct. It would comprehend an attenuation of the Lexicography definitions until the last vestige of a shade between objects, would disappear. Insert Mr. M'Lane's substitute, or amendment of the constitution, and would its meaning be improved by it? Congress shall have power to "facilitate" commerce.

Cannot gentlemen see, that these are the mere efforts of anxious, aspiring geniūs, to free itself from all constitutional restraints, against the effectuation of favorite objects? and only serve as mental salvos to the Lexicographer.



71.2009.084.09890

